

of Hamilton, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, favoring the passage of a bill to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. W. Heitz, of New Era, Ind., to abolish the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of the New Haven (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring House bill No. 9243, providing regulations to limit length and width of tows in inland waters—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Petition of citizens of Weld County, Colo., in favor of the bill to tax oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3953, granting honorable certificates of discharge to certain officers and enlisted men of the United States volunteer service who were called out by the proclamation of Gen. Lewis Wallace issued September 5, 1862—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Springer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of New Haven, Conn., favoring House bill 9243, providing for regulations to limit the length and width of tows in United States inland waters—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants' Association of Waterbury, Conn., urging the passage of the bill for a public building at Waterbury, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STARK: Petition of W. F. Barry Post, No. 159, Etna, Pa., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home for disabled soldiers near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 7812, granting a pension to Lydia Strang, dependent foster mother of William P. Lewis, late of Company I, First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, Spanish war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Oliver B. Pettie and 32 other citizens of Francetown, N. H., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protests of Miss Vera Cate and others, of Charmingfare, and Edward M. Hoyt and others, of Dover, N. H., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petition of Louis Sawyer and 10 citizens of Madrid, Nebr., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Gettysburg Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Trenton, Nebr., in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolutions of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, in relation to the Puerto Rican tariff—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Resolutions of Posts 582, 584, 211, and 389, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolutions of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, expressing confidence in the wisdom of the Administration and of Congress in relation to legislation in the interests of the island of Puerto Rico—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of Captain W. W. Sloan Post, No. 318; W. L. Sloan Post, No. 191, and Delahunt Post, No. 152, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, indorsing the bill to establish a Branch Home for disabled soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 27, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

AGES OF EMPLOYEES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, certain information relative to the number of persons employed in the several bureaus of the Post-Office Department between certain specified ages, etc.; which, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed

the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 240) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wakefield;

A bill (H. R. 301) granting a pension to James T. Donaldson, jr.;

A bill (H. R. 457) granting a pension to Clara L. Harriman;

A bill (H. R. 493) granting a pension to Fanny M. Hays;

A bill (H. R. 548) granting a pension to Edward Harris;

A bill (H. R. 625) granting an increase of pension to Wesley

Reed;

A bill (H. R. 642) granting an increase of pension to Charles C.

Doolittle;

A bill (H. R. 657) granting a pension to Francis A. Kitchen;

A bill (H. R. 737) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Middleton;

A bill (H. R. 741) granting an increase of pension to Zedock C.

Andrews;

A bill (H. R. 1147) granting an increase of pension to Luke H.

Cooper;

A bill (H. R. 1172) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 1677) granting an increase of pension to Missouri

B. Ross;

A bill (H. R. 1681) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M.

Locke;

A bill (H. R. 1800) granting a pension to Lutheria H. Maynard;

A bill (H. R. 1946) granting a pension to Jane F. Chalmers;

A bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to Horace N.

Brackett;

A bill (H. R. 2203) granting an increase of pension to John M.

Garrett;

A bill (H. R. 2397) granting a pension to Eliza S. Redfield;

A bill (H. R. 2623) granting a pension to Melville Oliphant;

A bill (H. R. 2728) granting a pension to Thomas T. Garrison;

A bill (H. R. 2748) granting an increase of pension to Henry

Schnetberg;

A bill (H. R. 2999) granting an increase of pension to George

M. Brown;

A bill (H. R. 3021) granting a pension to Eliza H. Getchel;

A bill (H. R. 3131) granting a pension to Matilda O'Connor;

A bill (H. R. 3214) granting a pension to John S. Dukate;

A bill (H. R. 3225) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bent Cooper;

A bill (H. R. 3268) granting an increase of pension to James W.

Kessler;

A bill (H. R. 3307) granting a pension to Matilda Hennessy;

A bill (H. R. 3312) granting an increase of pension to Ellen V.

Myer;

A bill (H. R. 3454) granting a pension to Joseph E. Baldwin;

A bill (H. R. 3563) granting an increase of pension to Julia A.

Floyd;

A bill (H. R. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Timothy

B. Eastman;

A bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus

Lavine;

A bill (H. R. 3654) granting a pension to Calvin E. Myers;

A bill (H. R. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Abraham

Sanford;

A bill (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to Joshua

Ricketts;

A bill (H. R. 3775) granting an increase of pension to Robert

Boston;

A bill (H. R. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Frances

D. Best;

A bill (H. R. 3869) granting a pension to Joseph H. Hamrick

and Ella G. Hamrick;

A bill (H. R. 3941) granting a pension to Samuel B. Weeks;

A bill (H. R. 3962) granting an increase of pension to Alanson

C. Eberhart;

A bill (H. R. 4030) granting an increase of pension to Margaret

L. Coleman;

A bill (H. R. 4089) granting a pension to Emily Burke;

A bill (H. R. 4138) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth

A. Hyatt;

A bill (H. R. 4180) granting an increase of pension to Austin J.

Pickett;

A bill (H. R. 4247) granting an increase of pension to Francis S.

Wolfe;

A bill (H. R. 4267) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A.

Bennett;

A bill (H. R. 4276) granting an increase of pension to John R.

Eggeman;

A bill (H. R. 4398) granting a pension to Julius Vogt;

A bill (H. R. 4562) granting a pension to Lois A. Fields;

A bill (H. R. 4654) granting an increase of pension to Simon Van

Der Vaart;

A bill (H. R. 4657) granting a pension to Laura S. Pontious;

A bill (H. R. 4675) granting an increase of pension to Robert H.

Jones;

A bill (H. R. 4681) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth

Keiff;

A bill (H. R. 4696) granting an increase of pension to Ruthven W. Houghton;
 A bill (H. R. 4791) granting a pension to Catharine A. Schwunger;
 A bill (H. R. 4805) granting a pension to Isaac Price;
 A bill (H. R. 4828) granting a pension to Susie E. Johnson;
 A bill (H. R. 4832) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Graves;
 A bill (H. R. 4991) granting a pension to Maria V. Sperry;
 A bill (H. R. 5067) concerning the boarding of vessels;
 A bill (H. R. 5088) granting an increase of pension to William G. Willoughby;
 A bill (H. R. 5110) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Kennedy;
 A bill (H. R. 5127) granting a pension to John Lafollett;
 A bill (H. R. 5134) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Allison;
 A bill (H. R. 5169) granting an increase of pension to Charles Weed;
 A bill (H. R. 5170) granting a pension to Cyrus Johnson;
 A bill (H. R. 5171) granting an increase of pension to William R. Wallace;
 A bill (H. R. 5209) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Greeley;
 A bill (H. R. 5211) granting a pension to Lizzie M. Dixon;
 A bill (H. R. 5435) granting an increase of pension to Alexander P. Baugher;
 A bill (H. R. 5552) for the relief of Northrup & Chick, and also of Thomas N. Stinson;
 A bill (H. R. 5886) granting a pension to William H. Lane;
 A bill (H. R. 5961) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Hausman;
 A bill (H. R. 5970) granting a pension to Phebe S. Riley;
 A bill (H. R. 6019) granting a pension to Mrs. Therese W. Hard;
 A bill (H. R. 6089) granting a pension to Alfred T. Moreland;
 A bill (H. R. 6159) granting an increase of pension to Arnold Bloom;
 A bill (H. R. 6195) granting a pension to Livingston B. Gregory;
 A bill (H. R. 6240) for the preparation of plans or designs for a memorial or statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on ground belonging to the United States Government in the city of Washington, D. C.;
 A bill (H. R. 6304) granting an increase of pension to James J. Lyons;
 A bill (H. R. 6344) to remove the charges of desertion from the records of the War Department against Frederick Mehring;
 A bill (H. R. 6372) granting a pension to Abbie E. Webster;
 A bill (H. R. 6375) granting an increase of pension to Chester Willis;
 A bill (H. R. 6486) granting an increase of pension to Orange F. Berden;
 A bill (H. R. 6624) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bradley;
 A bill (H. R. 6731) granting an increase of pension to William F. Tait;
 A bill (H. R. 6784) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Neff;
 A bill (H. R. 6785) granting an increase of pension to Maria Egan;
 A bill (H. R. 6885) granting a pension to Horace B. Durant;
 A bill (H. R. 6900) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Kurtz;
 A bill (H. R. 6952) granting a pension to Carrie P. Dale;
 A bill (H. R. 6995) granting a pension to Catharine Harris;
 A bill (H. R. 7177) granting an increase of pension to John N. Breed;
 A bill (H. R. 7488) granting a pension to John C. Ray;
 A bill (H. R. 7535) granting an increase of pension to Clare H. Burleigh;
 A bill (H. R. 7596) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Wight;
 A bill (H. R. 7599) granting an increase of pension to John F. Crawford;
 A bill (H. R. 7767) granting a pension to Alice D. Roatch;
 A bill (H. R. 7799) granting an increase of pension to Franklin M. Burdoin;
 A bill (H. R. 7939) to amend an act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement;
 A bill (H. R. 8045) granting an increase of pension to Wilford Cooper;
 A bill (H. R. 8079) granting a pension to Bertha M. Jordan;
 A bill (H. R. 8083) granting an increase of pension to James Winnie;
 A bill (H. R. 8112) granting a pension to John Vogler;
 A bill (H. R. 8120) granting an increase of pension to David L. Wentworth;
 A bill (H. R. 8339) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Gates;
 A bill (H. R. 8378) granting an increase of pension to Mary Steffens;

A bill (H. R. 8390) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Mitchell;
 A bill (H. R. 8395) granting an increase of pension to Henry Johns;
 A bill (H. R. 8405) granting a pension to Sophronia Seely;
 A bill (H. R. 8599) granting a pension to Ellen J. Williams;
 A bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to Joseph Champlin Stone;
 A bill (H. R. 8610) granting an increase of pension to Abner S. Crawford;
 A bill (H. R. 8669) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Lake;
 A bill (H. R. 8800) granting an increase of pension to Bell Fries; and
 A bill (H. R. 9070) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Kent.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 206) granting an increase of pension to Isaac D. Smith;
 A bill (H. R. 539) granting a pension to Louisa S. Wilson;
 A bill (H. R. 541) granting a pension to Ellen Norwood;
 A bill (H. R. 1944) granting an increase of pension to Eli C. Walton;
 A bill (H. R. 1989) granting a pension to Marie Wiersang;
 A bill (H. R. 2332) granting an increase of pension to Eli Overhultz;
 A bill (H. R. 2389) granting an increase of pension to Edward Boyle;
 A bill (H. R. 2792) granting a pension to Peter Cummings;
 A bill (H. R. 2802) granting an increase of pension to John W. Brisbois;
 A bill (H. R. 3470) granting an increase of pension to George W. Weeden;
 A bill (H. R. 3809) granting an increase of pension to Elisha B. Seaman;
 A bill (H. R. 3966) granting an increase of pension to David Talmon;
 A bill (H. R. 4298) granting an increase of pension to John M. McCord;
 A bill (H. R. 4441) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Krickbaum;
 A bill (H. R. 4854) granting a pension to James L. Whidden;
 A bill (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Gangloff;
 A bill (H. R. 5126) granting an increase of pension to James J. McManes;
 A bill (H. R. 5180) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Adams;
 A bill (H. R. 5229) granting a pension to Sarah Potter;
 A bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to Loua A. Morgan;
 A bill (H. R. 5546) granting an increase of pension to George White;
 A bill (H. R. 5949) granting a pension to Frederick Weber;
 A bill (H. R. 6028) granting a pension to John H. Meeker;
 A bill (H. R. 6031) granting an increase of pension to James W. Carmody;
 A bill (H. R. 6092) granting a pension to Louisa Stearns;
 A bill (H. R. 6139) granting a pension to Lucinda Haggard;
 A bill (H. R. 6144) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Porter;
 A bill (H. R. 6911) granting an increase of pension to James R. Sawtell;
 A bill (H. R. 7114) granting an increase of pension to John S. Parker;
 A bill (H. R. 7368) granting an increase of pension to Sherman D. Plues;
 A bill (H. R. 7622) granting an increase of pension to Peter M. Heaton; and
 A bill (H. R. 7896) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Lybarger.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a memorial of Local Union No. 86, National Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate electrical wiring in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry druggists of Fredonia and Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Dryden, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army

canteens and also in any of the new possessions; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Dorpian Lodge, No. 204, International Association of Machinists, of Schenectady, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation granting thirty days' annual leave of absence to navy-yard and arsenal employees; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Utica, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reorganization of the consular service; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Typefounders' Union, No. 1, of New York, praying that the Public Printer be authorized to print the label of the Allied Printing Trades on all publications issued by the Government; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a memorial of the German Insurance Journal, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and a memorial of E. L. Kellogg & Co., of New York City, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Utica, N. Y., praying that an appropriation be made to continue the work of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Syracuse Lodge, No. 881, International Association of Machinists, of Syracuse, N. Y., and a petition of Lock City Lodge, No. 439, International Association of Machinists, of Lockport, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of machinists employed in the Government Printing Office; which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a petition of Madison County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Earlville, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the adulteration of food products, for the election of United States Senators by a popular vote of the people, for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the New York Zoological Society, of New York City, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the protection and preservation of wild birds and quadrupeds; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Kings County Medical Association, of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dunkirk, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors in Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

Mr. SEWELL presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry citizens of Flemington, N. J., extending sympathy to the people of the South African Republic and Orange Free State in their struggle for independence; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Haddonfield, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in our new possessions, and also in our Army; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented sundry memorials of the members of the District Medical Society of Mercer County, N. J., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5503) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hanson;

A bill (H. R. 2681) granting an increase of pension to Calista F. Hall;

A bill (H. R. 2865) granting an increase of pension to Louis H. Gein; and

A bill (S. 3536) restoring to the pension roll the name of Mary J. Calvin.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3306) granting an increase of pension to Moses King, jr., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3306) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda D. Dow;

A bill (S. 1593) granting an increase of pension to Clara H. Inch;

A bill (S. 1907) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Paulding Meade;

A bill (S. 1822) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Shup;

A bill (S. 1226) granting a pension to George G. Kemp;

A bill (S. 2550) granting a pension to C. W. Hobart;

A bill (S. 3508) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Phelps; and

A bill (S. 3293) granting a pension to Helen Harlow.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. KYLE), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 292) granting an increase of pension to Martha G. D. Lyster;

A bill (H. R. 3167) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Cook;

A bill (H. R. 3170) granting a pension to Angeline Eyestone;

A bill (H. R. 153) granting a pension to Elizabeth Johns; and

A bill (S. 3502) granting a pension to Elizabeth Whisler.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. KYLE), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3630) granting an increase of pension to J. N. Smith, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. PRITCHARD), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1890) to increase the pension of John Houk, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. PRITCHARD), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2994) granting a pension to Fanny F. Robertson, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER (for Mr. TURNER), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 306) granting an increase of pension to Warren L. Eaton, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. TURNER) from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3049) granting an increase of pension to Mary U. Wilmarth, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 434) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Smith;

A bill (H. R. 1754) granting a pension to Helen M. Hull; and

A bill (H. R. 3694) granting an increase of pension to James Bottoms.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 4655) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Rice; and

A bill (S. 683) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Hippler.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1207) granting a pension to Levi Chandler;

A bill (S. 1637) granting a pension to George B. Hayden; and

A bill (S. 2110) to restore John R. McCoy to the pension roll.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 1672) granting a pension to Susie Gilbert; and

A bill (S. 647) granting an increase of pension to John Sirrine.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3079) granting an increase of pension to William Oliver, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 92) granting a pension to William M. Ferry, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1463) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Pitts;

A bill (H. R. 1458) granting an increase of pension to John E. Whinnery; and

A bill (H. R. 1507) granting an increase of pension to William H. La Count.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2001) granting a pension to John M. Essington, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3154) granting an increase of pension to Kate Cadwell, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 480) granting an increase of pension to Juliet Gregory;

A bill (S. 3748) granting an increase of pension to Washington Baker;

A bill (H. R. 2809) granting an increase of pension to Moses F. Woods;

A bill (H. R. 7332) granting an increase of pension to Frederick E. Vance; and

A bill (H. R. 5346) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Norris.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1734) granting a pension to Mary S. Belding, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 1201) granting a pension to James McNutt; and

A bill (H. R. 6527) granting an increase of pension to George Myers.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 390) to regulate the taking of proofs and filings in certain land cases, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 3431) to grant lands to the State of Alabama for the purposes of education of colored students at Montgomery, Ala., heretofore reported from that committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 3803) granting a pension to Cecelia B. Chauncey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 3804) to amend section 4965, chapter 3, Title LX, of the Revised Statutes, relating to copyrights; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 3805) for the relief of Sylvester S. Van Sickle; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 3806) granting an honorable discharge to John W. Tiffany; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 3807) making appropriation for the removal of an obstruction in the naval channel of Elizabeth River, Virginia, in the approach to the navy-yard, known as Hospital Point; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3808) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of R. L. Pritchard & Co., of Page County, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3809) for the relief of E. H. Murrell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BARD introduced a bill (S. 3810) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 3811) authorizing the Postmaster-General to consolidate the Quincy and Wollaston post-offices, in the city of Quincy, in the State of Massachusetts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 3812) to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 3813) for the relief of R. B. Goodman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3814) for the relief of W. L. Barnes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MONEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 3815) for the relief of Patrick J. Finley;

A bill (S. 3816) for the relief of the estate of John T. Rawlings, deceased;

A bill (S. 3817) for the relief of W. A. Hopper, administrator of David Hopper, deceased;

A bill (S. 3818) for the relief of Joseph S. Acuff;

A bill (S. 3819) for the relief of James H. Knox;

A bill (S. 3820) for the relief of Henry M. Cobb;

A bill (S. 3821) for the relief of the estate of T. J. McFarland, deceased;

A bill (S. 3822) for the relief of Jacob Joiner;

A bill (S. 3823) for the relief of Lewis Jones;

A bill (S. 3824) for the relief of James T. Blair;

A bill (S. 3825) for the relief of Aquila Bowie;

A bill (S. 3826) for the relief of the estate of Jane N. Gibson, deceased;

A bill (S. 3827) for the relief of Patrick Foley;

A bill (S. 3828) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Hawes, deceased;

A bill (S. 3829) for the relief of U. Lunenburger;

A bill (S. 3830) for the relief of the estate of Dr. J. P. Davis, deceased;

A bill (S. 3831) for the relief of the estate of Mary H. Moore, deceased;

A bill (S. 3832) for the relief of the estate of Thomas P. Young, deceased;

A bill (S. 3833) for the relief of Susan C. Robinson;

A bill (S. 3834) for the relief of Solomon Geisenberg;

A bill (S. 3835) for the relief of Elizabeth Johnson;

A bill (S. 3836) for the relief of Mrs. Ann M. Brown;

A bill (S. 3837) for the relief of Louis Sommer;

A bill (S. 3838) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. C. L. Shafer;

A bill (S. 3839) for the relief of the estate of William R. Tinsley, deceased;

A bill (S. 3840) for the relief of the estate of D. B. Downing;

A bill (S. 3841) for the relief of the estate of W. S. Hyland, deceased;

A bill (S. 3842) for the relief of D. O. Perkins;

A bill (S. 3843) for the relief of the estate of Z. C. Offatt, deceased;

A bill (S. 3844) for the relief of the estate of Landon L. Lea;

A bill (S. 3845) for the relief of L. B. F. Champion;

A bill (S. 3846) for the relief of the estate of J. K. Morrison, deceased; and

A bill (S. 3847) for the relief of Robert Moss.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 3848) granting an increase of pension to Azariah S. Elwood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3849) granting a pension to John D. Vaughan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 3850) to establish and maintain, in connection with the Department of Justice of the United States, a division to be known as the Bureau of Criminal Information, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CASSIUS M. BARNES, GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA.

Mr. HARRIS submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate all papers on file in the Department of the Interior, including all charges, affidavits, letters, protests, and exhibits against Cassius M. Barnes, governor of Oklahoma Territory, filed since March 4, 1897, prior and subsequent to his appointment as such governor, together with the opinion of the Assistant Attorney-General and recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, if any, concerning such charges.

STENOGRAPHER FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report hearings upon matters that may be pending before said committee, the expense to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the necessary expenses of the inquiries already made by said committee be paid from said fund.

READJUSTED SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS IN MAINE.

Mr. FRYE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, directed to report upon a schedule to the Senate the readjusted salaries of all postmasters who served in the State of Maine between July 1, 1884, and July 1, 1874, whose names as claimants appear in the Court of Claims in the case entitled David Vinal and others vs. The United States, No. 18238, each such stated account to conform in all respects to the order of the Postmaster-General published by circular under date of June 9, 1883, and to the requirement of the act of March 3, 1883, as said requirement was published by the Postmaster-General in the newspapers of the country under date of February 17, 1884, and with such report transmit to the Senate a full copy of the text of the construction by the Postmaster-General of the act of March 3, 1883, embodied in the said circular and publication in the newspapers and in circular form No. 1223, the text of each of which under date of November 8, 1897, was transmitted by the Postmaster-General to the Attorney-General for use in the case of Jane Yarrington and others vs. The United States, No. 18345.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. STEWART. I submit an order for which I ask immediate consideration. I will state that I have had an estimate of the cost

of printing the report referred to, and am informed that it can be done for \$500.

The order was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 4,000 copies of Senate Report No. 711, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, on the public schools of the District of Columbia.

LEVI C. FAUGHT.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the bill returned from the House granting a pension to Levi C. Faught may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following bill, recalled from the House of Representatives. The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 477) granting a pension to Levi C. Faught.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the motion to reconsider the votes by which the bill was read a third time and passed be now acted upon.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is a bill for a blind ex-soldier. It has passed in a form that probably would result in the Bureau of Pensions not granting the pension. I move to amend it by adding to the bill the words: "and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "Guards," in line 7, insert "and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be put upon its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota. [Mr. HANSBROUGH]. The amendment will be again read.

Mr. CARTER. At the time the motion was made to proceed to the consideration of executive business yesterday afternoon the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] was addressing the Senate on this amendment. I observe that he is not at the present moment in the Chamber, and I therefore ask that the amendment be temporarily laid aside, to the end that he may be present when it is further considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana, that the motion to amend be temporarily laid aside? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

Mr. CARTER. I present an amendment to be inserted as indicated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, at the end of section 26, insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That, subject only to such general limitations as may be necessary to exempt navigation from artificial obstructions, all land and shoal water below mean high tide on the shores, bays, and inlets of Bering Sea, within the jurisdiction of the United States, shall be subject to exploration for gold and other precious metals by citizens of the United States, or persons who have legally declared their intention to become such, under such reasonable rules and regulations as the miners in organized mining districts may have heretofore made, or may hereafter make, governing the temporary possession thereof for exploration and mining purposes, until otherwise provided by law; and all permits heretofore granted authorizing any person or persons, corporation or company, to excavate or mine under any of said waters are hereby revoked and declared null and void.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the amendment just read relates to a subject on which some comment was made a few days ago in the Senate Chamber in connection with a resolution presented by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], calling upon the Secretary of War to advise the Senate what, if any, permits or privileges had been granted to any person or corporation to mine upon the coast of Alaska. In reply to that resolution the Secretary of War, by a communication dated the 23d instant, explains the conditions under which permits were issued, the extent or scope of such permits, and the purpose he had in view in issuing them.

The conditions existing at Cape Nome and along the coast of Bering Sea are unique. They were not in contemplation at the time certain laws were enacted for the regulation of persons or companies desiring to excavate under the shoal waters of the sea. For the purpose of preventing encroachments upon the navigable waters, the erection of structures tending to obstruct navigation, or excavations intended to injuriously affect navigable waters, Congress, it seems, from the report of the Secretary of War, passed this law on the 3d of March, 1899, to wit:

It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead,

haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same.

The Secretary then proceeds to show the penalty provided by law for any violation of the section which I have just quoted. The penalty, in short, is that on conviction thereof—that is, of any of the acts enumerated in the statute—the person shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,500 nor less than \$500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such punishments, in the discretion of the court.

The Secretary of War, believing that this act would injuriously affect and unnecessarily restrain citizens of the United States desiring to explore the shoal waters of Bering Sea for minerals, determined deliberately, as a course of policy, to issue permits to any citizens of the United States upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers to explore this gold-bearing coast within the 3-mile limit. That his purpose was a laudable one and in harmony with the general sentiment existing in Congress there can be no question. He merely exempts by the permit a citizen who may desire to mine on that coast from the penalties which would be inflicted under the law if the permit were not granted previous to the beginning of the work.

In a personal interview I inquired of the Secretary of War the reason why a general order had not been promulgated authorizing all persons to prosecute investigations and explorations on that coast. In reply he cited the law, which provides that the work must be recommended by the Chief of Engineers, and in consequence of this recommendation being a prerequisite, each application must pass through the office of the Chief of Engineers and be separately passed upon by him. Under the law as it now stands the Secretary of War, in the exercise of the discretion given by the law, will exempt all citizens who may apply to him in the regular manner prescribed by the statute from the penalties inflicted on those who do not secure permits.

It is obvious that upon arriving in Bering Sea hundreds of persons may desire to avail themselves of the privileges of mining along the coast, but will be deprived of so doing unless at the hazard of incurring the severe penalties prescribed by the statute until they shall have had time to send an application to the Chief of Engineers, to be by him passed on to the Secretary of War.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I did not hear the beginning of his remarks. What remedy does the Senator propose for the evil that is complained of?

Mr. CARTER. The remedy proposed is embodied in an amendment which I have presented, and which is now under consideration.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator be kind enough to have it read? I did not hear it.

Mr. CARTER. I would be glad if the Secretary would again report the amendment for the information of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again read.

The Secretary again read Mr. CARTER's amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to suggest to the Senator that this amendment ought to include a provision nullifying any permits hereafter granted by the Secretary of War.

Mr. CARTER. No permit can hereafter be granted under the terms of the amendment in those waters, because by the express terms of the amendment—

Mr. ALLEN. Under what provision of law does the Secretary profess to have this power?

Mr. CARTER. The provision I have heretofore cited. I will cite it again for the Senator's benefit. In the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, this provision occurs:

It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same.

On the next page of the report the Senator will find that a drastic penalty is provided for any violation of this law by the individual.

Mr. ALLEN. But what I was calling for is the law that gives the Secretary of War authority to grant mining permits between high and low tide.

Mr. CARTER. No permit has ever been granted by the Secretary of War for mining purposes. It so happens—it is a matter of common knowledge, indeed—that the purpose of dredging in those waters would be for gold, but the same permit is granted there that would be granted along the New Jersey coast to a farmer, or builder, or a person having use for sand, to excavate and carry away loads of sand from along that coast.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator another question. Are not all the mining lands of the United States, upland and tide lands, withdrawn from permits of this kind by other statutes?

Mr. CARTER. Not at all. The jurisdiction of the Secretary

of War is extended over the navigable waters of the United States for the purpose manifestly of protecting navigation.

Mr. ALLEN. For the purposes of navigation and commerce.

Mr. CARTER. And in connection with navigation the right is given to protect the bottom of the sea, the lakes, the inlets, and shoal waters from excavation or intrusion or invasion by any person except by a permit from the Secretary of War.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, suppose there is no necessity for improvement at this harbor, but a man goes to the Secretary of War and says, "There is gold underlying the waters there; there is no necessity for improvement for navigation purposes, but I should like to have a permit to go there and deepen the harbor and receive my compensation in the gold or precious minerals that I can find in the sand," does not the Senator realize that a permit granted under those circumstances is a mere subterfuge and does not come within the purview of this statute?

Mr. CARTER. I think that the permit comes within the purview of this statute precisely as a permit granted to a farmer on the New Jersey coast to build a pier out into the sea a hundred feet for his own accommodation would come within the authority of the Secretary of War under this section of the statute.

Mr. COCKRELL. But it gives no monopoly of that right.

Mr. CARTER. No monopoly was granted here. None was pretended to be granted.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, the power granted by this statute is a power to improve the harbor for commercial purposes.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator in that respect is in error. The authority granted here is for the purpose of preventing injury to the navigable waters of the United States and not for the improvement of them.

Mr. ALLEN. Injury in what respect?

Mr. CARTER. By placing obstructions, making injurious excavations, or in any one of the many ways in which navigation might be injuriously affected.

Mr. ALLEN. But, if the Senator will bear with me, it is not claimed that in any one of these instances there was any necessity for improvement or a necessity for any repairs to that harbor at that time.

Mr. CARTER. None whatever; nor was it expected that any repairs would ever be made along that coast.

Mr. ALLEN. Now, then, if there was no necessity for improvement, why does the Secretary of War, under this slimy power or slimy statute, which does not cover his case at all, grant permits the primary and sole purpose of which is to go into those waters and disturb commerce by mining?

Mr. CARTER. The Secretary of War did not give a mining permit, but gave such a formal permit as would relieve the individual obtaining it from the penalty of the statute that was manifestly not intended by Congress to apply under such conditions.

Mr. ALLEN. I suppose he knew that the permit was valuable only in consequence of the minerals, and that that was the chief purpose in taking out the permit. Is not that knowledge to be construed as a part of the permit, and is it not to be construed into a permit to mine?

Mr. COCKRELL. And excluding everybody else.

Mr. ALLEN. And excluding other persons from doing so?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, there was no exclusion and no intention to exclude.

Mr. COCKRELL. Did it not operate in that way?

Mr. CARTER. The Secretary of War merely relieved the individual who received the permit from the penalties of a statute which would inevitably and by operation of law apply to the individual if not protected by the permit.

Mr. ALLEN. Did not the Secretary of War thereby say, "You may go on and mine those sands ad libitum?"

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I interrupt the Senator from Montana to answer the Senator from Nebraska, as the Senator from Montana and I have both looked more or less into this question?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the waters of Cape Nome, below the low-water mark, where developments have shown that the soil is rich and the sands are gold bearing, they have to be reached by boats and dredges, for, as a matter of fact, there is no navigation there; there is no channel to help or to injure. Those sands are far away from the possibilities of development by helping the channel by excavation or injuring navigation by their presence; but when prospectors for gold reached those waters they found the presence of a statute upon our books which never was intended to apply to such a case as this, for in the whole history of the world there never was a time when the rich alluvial sands under the ocean bore gold until here.

But this statute existed. It was a form of prohibition along our coast forbidding anybody to excavate or dredge except under the authority of the Secretary of War. It was a fiction so far as its applicability to these soils went; but it was an existing statute forbidding work. Whereupon the Secretary of War issued these

permits, Congress not having acted. He issued the permits indifferently to every responsible person who applied for them, to do away with the formality of the statute. There seems to have been no favoritism, no desire on anybody's part to exclude anybody, but to open the land so far as could be in this anomalous condition, and to do away with the prohibition of the statute by giving permits alike to every responsible person who asked for them.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I wish the Senator would read that statute.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have it not with me, but the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] has it.

Mr. CARTER. The statute refers to the prohibition and likewise to the penalty, and will be found in Senate Document No. 239, the response of the Secretary of War to the resolution of the Senate of March 21, 1900.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from Montana, in the kindness of his heart, indulge me a moment, that I may reply briefly to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CARTER. Most assuredly, and with great pleasure.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, there is nothing in this statute, not a word, that would give the Secretary of War the power to issue mining permits. It simply provides that—

It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same.

It is not claimed that the Chief of Engineers recommended this.

Mr. CARTER. It is claimed that the Chief of Engineers recommended it in every case. That is the fact.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, without consuming too much of the time of the Senator from Montana, who has been kind enough to give way to me, let me drop this observation: The purpose of this statute was to control the harbors, rivers, havens, bays, etc., within the limits of the United States, for the purposes of navigation. They were put under the charge of the War Department that they might be systematically improved where improvement was necessary, and that individuals and corporations might not run indiscriminately into the navigable waters of the United States, and by excavations disturb the channels and waters, thereby impeding navigation.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], I think, correctly states the fact that this condition is anomalous. There has been nothing in the history of the world like it. But, Mr. President, when these parties applied for permission to disturb the waters and the sands beneath them at Cape Nome, it was known that those sands were valuable for mining purposes solely. No person had recommended the dredging at that cape; there was no purpose on the part of Congress to make appropriation to dredge or to widen it, or in any respect to change it from its natural condition; but it was known that the wash of the rivers and creeks from the mainland had put into the sands of Cape Nome large deposits of valuable gold; and when these persons applied to the War Department to secure these permits, that knowledge, at least presumptively, was in the possession of the Secretary of War; and when he granted the permits, he granted them with the full knowledge that the purpose of the licensees was to go into the waters there and dig into those sands for minerals.

Now, do not both the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Montana believe that it would have been more in keeping with the dignity of a great Cabinet officer to have said, "This harbor does not need improvement at this time; there is no purpose of improving it; let this matter rest until Congress convenes, and let these sands be treated as a part of the mineral reserve of the United States," and withheld these permits and not given these special privileges?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, may I remind the Senator from Nebraska that we have by law again and again declared that the mineral lands of the United States are open to entry, prospecting, and occupation by citizens of the United States or those who have declared their intention to become such; and does not the Senator from Nebraska know that the lust for gold stops at nothing? Wherever there are valuable metals to be found—the Arctic region is not too far north, nor the Torrid region too hot for men to search for them—and to say to such men, to these hardy prospectors, "Until Congress acts you shall not get at these shifting sands under the water" would have been, first, to deny to the people their rights, and second, would have been a useless effort to prevent those hardy prospectors from doing what they would be sure to attempt. Does not the Senator think that what the Secretary of War did was the wisest possible thing—to issue permits, and not leave those people in the technical position of violating the law?

Mr. ALLEN. No, Mr. President, the Secretary of War simply perverted a statute which was intended to protect the harbors and navigable waters of the United States and territory under the jurisdiction of the United States Government from disturbance

by interlopers. He simply perverted that statute, which has no relation whatever to mining, into granting mining permits to a few individuals to go into the harbor and mine without restraint. However much it may be glossed over, that is what it is.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like to know whether any of these permits covered any particular area of surface or are they general?

Mr. CARTER. The permits protect the persons within certain specified limits. The Secretary of War very wisely refrained from granting to any person an unlimited right as to the extent of country to disturb the waters of Bering Sea.

Mr. DAVIS. Was it to equally protect every person having a permit within certain limits?

Mr. CARTER. Unquestionably.

Mr. DAVIS. And not giving any exclusive privileges?

Mr. CARTER. Not giving any privileges or exclusive rights. It was not a permit to mine, and by no kind of contortion can it be made to appear so. It was an exemption from the penalties of the statute.

Mr. ALLEN. Suppose some other person had gone on to the 2-mile limit granted to this particular individual. What would have happened to him?

Mr. CARTER. If he had a permit he would be exempt from prosecution—simply that, and nothing more.

Mr. ALLEN. Suppose one man was granted a 2-mile permit, and possibly some interloper, having the lust for gold to which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has referred, and which I presume exists, had gone on to that 2-mile limit. What would have happened to him?

Mr. CARTER. Why, Mr. President, 100 permits might have been granted to as many persons for excavating within the same square mile.

Mr. ALLEN. I know; but here are 2 miles granted to one individual.

Mr. CARTER. The individual in that permit named can not be prosecuted by the authorities of the United States for excavating sand within that limit; and if another person without a permit should go on it, he would become liable to the penalties provided by law.

Mr. ALLEN. Suppose some other person having a permit had gone on the sands of a person holding a permit; what would have been his status?

Mr. CARTER. His status would have been that of any other person who disregarded the laws of the United States. Having the possibility of getting a permit, and having neglected so to do, he would incur the penalty, of course.

Mr. ALLEN. Was not the permit really the granting of an exclusive easement in the licensee?

Mr. CARTER. It was not, and can not be so considered. The licenses granted would have been granted to any citizen of the United States, or any person having declared his intention to become such, upon application to the Secretary of War in the manner prescribed by the law of the country.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator does not apprehend my question. A receives a permit extending over 2 miles—

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. And B, without a permit, trespasses upon the land embraced within A's permit. The Senator says B would be a trespasser and amenable to the law.

Mr. CARTER. Not as against A. He would be a violator of the laws of the United States, and could not protect himself, if prosecuted, by showing a permit.

Mr. ALLEN. Does not the Senator think it would have been wiser for the Secretary of War to have declared that all these lands, if they were to be opened by an order of his, should be open to the public indiscriminately?

Mr. CARTER. But if the Senator will read the statute to which I have repeatedly referred, he will find that the permit can only be granted on application presented through the Chief of Engineers and recommended by him. Permits can not be made by invisible people; the action of the Secretary of War can not have been based upon a dream.

Mr. ALLEN. No; but could not the Chief of Engineers have recommended the opening of the whole tide lands or the whole bottom of the cape?

Mr. CARTER. Not upon his own motion.

Mr. ALLEN. I know; but in the same way he did recommend it, could he not have recommended it to be opened up to all persons?

Mr. CARTER. I think the Secretary of War fairly construed the law, and I think the Senator will perceive that his contention is not well founded in that behalf.

Mr. ALLEN. I claim this law has no application whatever to the case.

Mr. CARTER. That is what the Secretary of War thought, and he thought therefore the penalties of the law ought not to be applied to persons going upon that coast.

Mr. ALLEN. Why did not the Secretary of War open the

whole thing up to the people to go there indiscriminately, as miners go into any other mining camp?

Mr. CARTER. The Secretary of War undoubtedly felt that Congress, having given him warrant for action, expected him to act in all proper cases. It is not the province of the Secretary of War or of any other Cabinet minister or officer of the Government to do more than execute the law as passed by Congress and approved by the President.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to call attention to the language of the law in question. It does not seem to me that there was any occasion for any permit to be asked from the Secretary of War or from anybody else to excavate those sands. The law quoted by the Secretary of War himself is as follows:

It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same.

I do not believe by any legitimate construction that can be held to apply to every particle of shore line of the United States away from a harbor or the mouth of a river or a breakwater or a canal. One of these permits here given states that it is 12 miles away from the mouth of Snake River. It seems to me the operation of the permit is simply this: Where there is no law to forbid persons going and excavating these sands, the Secretary of War has been induced to issue an order which, in effect, says that under this law no one, except by permission, may go and excavate these sands. He issued an order to Mr. George Max Esterly, of Seattle, Wash., in these words:

And whereas Mr. George Max Esterly, of Seattle, Wash., has applied to the Secretary of War for permission to excavate or fill within the following-described area in Bering Sea, near the mouth of Snake River, Alaska, commencing at a point 200 feet east of the junction of mean low-tide water on Bering Sea and the mean low water at the mouth and on the east bank of Snake River, which latter empties into Bering Sea about 12 miles a little north of west of Cape Nome, in Alaska; then extending along on the said mean low-tide line in a general westerly direction for a distance of 2 miles, and extending out 500 feet from the mean low-tide line, which work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers:

Now, therefore, this is to certify that the Secretary of War hereby gives permission to said George Max Esterly and assigns to excavate or fill within the area described above in Bering Sea, near the mouth of Snake River, Alaska, upon the following condition:

That the work herein permitted to be done shall not interfere with navigation or the rights of riparian owners, and shall be subject to the supervision and approval of the commanding general, Department of Alaska.

This permit begins 200 feet away from low water, at the mouth of Snake River, and runs 2 miles along the coast, where there is no river, no harbor, no canal, nothing on the face of the earth but open coast line. The Secretary of War has been induced to issue this order; and this Mr. Esterly will go in and say, "The Secretary of War says it is not lawful for any man to come here and excavate unless he does it by my permission. I am the only one who has permission; and you people who propose to come here and excavate and mine must, under the law, get out." The order of the Secretary of War has been obtained to put a meaning on the law that it has not, that it can not have, and that no court of justice anywhere in the world will give it.

It seems to me to be an absolutely indefensible outrage. I can not imagine any excuse for it. There is certainly nothing in the law to justify it, because it does not apply to an open coast line such as this, and can not be made to apply to it.

The next permit says:

And whereas F. S. Wood, of Alliance, Ohio, has applied to the Secretary of War for permission to excavate and fill within the following-described area in Bering Sea, near the mouth of Snake River, Alaska, commencing at mean low tide 3 miles east of the mouth of Snake River, which latter empties into Bering Sea about 12 miles a little north of west of Cape Nome, in Alaska; and from said point extending 1 mile east along shore at mean low tide and extending out into Bering Sea 500 feet, thus covering a space of 1 mile by 500 feet, which work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers, subject to the condition hereinafter set forth:

Now, therefore, this is to certify that the Secretary of War hereby gives unto said F. S. Wood and assigns permission to excavate and fill within the area described above, it being understood that this instrument is simply a permission to excavate and fill under said act, and is not exclusive within said area—

That language is not in the first permit. The first permit has no such words; and we all understand that a man thousands of miles away from the seat of government, hundreds of miles away from any court of justice, will claim that the order of the Secretary of War, putting those words in one permit and not putting them in the other, would mean that the other man had the right to claim that his privilege was exclusive, and to use it for himself alone, to the exclusion of everybody else. In addition, this second permit, this exemption from penalty by prosecution, makes it assignable, allows the holder to transfer his indemnity, which he derives from the Secretary of War, to anybody else who chooses to take it. It goes to F. S. Wood and his assigns, anybody to whom he proposes or chooses to transfer his immunity from prosecution.

It can go from him by assignment. That is a valuable right. What would be the use of having it assignable if any other man

had the same right and there was nothing exclusive in it, excepting it be claimed that this man having gone to the Secretary of War and got this right, the other man could not come in? There would be nobody there to protect such people, no court there to vindicate their rights, but only such laws as the miners may choose to enact. It is a simple means of driving honest miners out of an opportunity to labor and to confer the prosecution of this whole business on a handful, or at least a few, people who are considered responsible.

I did not finish reading that paragraph. It continues:

and that it may be withdrawn as to future work at the discretion of the Secretary of War.

Why has the Secretary of War the right to withdraw this sort of a permit and forbid people the right of excavating sands along the shore line of the country? The law he quotes only authorizes him to interfere where there is a likelihood of injury being done to some navigable water, to a harbor, to a breakwater, to a canal, to a river. It is not intended, never was intended, and can not by any violence of construction be held to apply to the simple shore line of the United States.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the statement of the Secretary of War very clearly sets forth the reasons why the permits were granted, and, with the permission of the Senate, I will insert in my remarks the portion of the statement which is explanatory.

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, March 23, 1900.

To the Senate of the United States:

I have the honor to reply to the following resolution of the Senate, dated March 21, 1900.

"Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to inform the Senate whether any concessions or grants to excavate the gold-bearing bed of the sea at or in the vicinity of Cape Nome, in Alaska, or in other Alaskan waters, has been made to any individual or individuals, or to any corporation or association of individuals, by the Secretary of War, or by any other official of the War Department, and, if so, to inform the Senate upon what theory of power or authority, if any, such concessions or grants were made."

No concessions or grants to excavate the gold-bearing bed of the sea at or in the vicinity of Cape Nome, in Alaska, or in other Alaskan waters, have been made by the Secretary of War or any other official of the War Department. Numerous applications have been received by the War Department for permits to excavate in the bed of the ocean in the vicinity of Cape Nome, in Alaska, in the exercise of the authority conferred upon the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War by section 10 of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, which provides:

"* * * It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same."

Section 12 of the same statute makes it a criminal offense to excavate without the required authority, however lawful the work may otherwise be, and provides that the offender "on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$2,500 nor less than \$500, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such punishments, in the discretion of the court." As this statute was designed solely for the protection of navigation, it has been the practice of the War Department to grant permits to persons desiring to excavate for any purpose when the work is not such as to injuriously affect navigation and is otherwise lawful. Permits thus granted are not exclusive; they do not preclude any number of similar permits applicable to the same territory; they are not grants or concessions, and they confer no rights whatever except immunity from prosecution under the statute above quoted secured in accordance with the terms of the statute and by reason of a compliance with the provisions thereof.

As there seems to be no legal reason why all citizens of the United States should not have the same opportunity to prospect for gold and acquire mining rights under the mining laws upon land under water as they have upon lands not under water, the Department determined, as a general policy in the exercise of the discretion vested in the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of War by this statute, to relieve all citizens applying from the obstacle interposed by this statute so long as their proposed operations do not in fact interfere with navigation. All applications made under this statute have accordingly, so far as it has been possible to dispose of them, received favorable action. No application of this description has been denied. Upon two, permits have been granted. Upon a third, papers have been prepared and were awaiting the Secretary of War's signature at the time of the passage of your resolution. Three others were approved by the Chief of Engineers and were in the hands of the Judge-Advocate-General for the preparation of the necessary papers. Eleven others are still in the office of the Chief of Engineers in process of examination upon the question whether they interfere with navigation. Four more just received are in the office of the Secretary of War, and will to-day be sent to the Chief of Engineers.

Unless otherwise directed by Congress, the Secretary of War will deem it his duty, in the exercise of the discretion vested in him by law, to grant permits in all of these cases and upon all other similar applications by citizens of the United States, provided that the work proposed does not injuriously affect navigation.

I annex hereto a copy of the form of permit prepared by the Judge-Advocate-General and used by the first two cases, and also an amended form which has been prepared by the Judge-Advocate-General for the Secretary of War's signature in the three cases mentioned, and which is being followed in the preparation of the papers in the other cases.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,
Secretary of War.

It is true this permit was made to the person named and to his assigns. That was a very proper thing to do.

Mr. COCKRELL. One question. Does the Chief of Engineers, then, pass upon the right of that assignee or does the Secretary of War thus delegate this right of the Chief of Engineers and himself to this one man, so that he can pick out anybody he chooses?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I have no doubt the Secretary of War intended the most liberal issue and the most liberal and unrestrained use of the privileges of mining within the waters

under his jurisdiction without any possibility of prosecution by the Federal authorities.

It has been the settled policy of this Government since gold was discovered in the country on the public domain to encourage the exploration, location, and development of mines. In the Cape Nome country the miners, in prospecting, came down to the waters of the sea, and there found that the rich gravel extended far beyond and under the water; but, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] has stated, at that point they were confronted by a penal statute of the United States, which said "thus far, but no farther." They found in the laws of the country what they believed constituted an authority in an executive officer to exempt them from the penalties to be inflicted if they invaded this sacred soil under the sea. They applied to the Secretary of War. Whereupon, recognizing the settled policy of the country to encourage rather than to retard the development of its mineral resources, and acting upon the inspiration drawn from that settled policy, the Secretary of War concluded that this penal statute was not intended to restrain the legitimate development of the mining industry. Actuated by that view, he issued these permits.

Now comes the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], and in glowing terms he informs us that the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War is complete over some of the navigable waters of Bering Sea, but not complete over other navigable waters of Bering Sea; or, in other words, the theory of the Senator from Arkansas would compel us to take a sounding line and determine by depth of water, if you please, where the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War ended and where nobody's jurisdiction applied. Are you to stop the Secretary of War where the water is 10 feet deep or 20 feet deep or 30 feet deep? Is his jurisdiction to be limited to 1 fathom or 10 fathoms? If the theory of construction and limitation upon his authority contended for by the Senator from Arkansas be true, then the exact line of his jurisdiction can never be determined until you have actually determined, first, the depth of the water which shall be the test, and then the depth of the water at the place where the party proposes to mine.

No, Mr. President, that is not a correct conception of the law nor a correct construction of it. The United States Government intended that some officer should have jurisdiction over navigable waters. In the wisdom of Congress that jurisdiction was placed in the Secretary of War; and it extends over all bodies of water within the 3-mile limit of the seashore and within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. President, it would seem that the exemption of an American citizen from a penalty, simply that, because nothing else was done, constituted a heinous offense, an outrage of the most gigantic proportions, according to the version of the Senator from Arkansas. These permits, according to the declared purpose of the Secretary of War, have been issued without limitation as to persons, to citizens of the United States or persons who have declared their intention to become such; and, further still, the Secretary of War says, in a clear, straightforward, manly, and unmistakable way, relying for authority upon the law, believing that under his oath of office it is his duty to execute it according to the light given him, he will continue to issue these permits until Congress shall otherwise direct.

Now, in the amendment here proposed we think we otherwise direct. We relieve the citizen upon that extensive coast of Bering Sea from the necessity of coming forward in each and every case and making an application through the Chief of Engineers; we allow every citizen and every person who has declared his intention to become a citizen to mine, explore, and excavate below mean high tide on the shores of Bering Sea within our jurisdiction, subject only to such reasonable limitations as may be necessary to prevent the actual obstruction of commerce, and subject to such reasonable rules and regulations as the miners themselves may prescribe. That is the sum and substance of the amendment. Its adoption is in harmony with the purpose of the Secretary of War, and will obviate the necessity for the issuance of innumerable permits, because it will give him general authority.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana always sheds light on any question he discusses; and I find that I see very much more clearly, and I think I understand much more fully the purpose and the origin of this permit system than I did before the Senator submitted his last remarks. He says, as I understand him, that these people in Alaska found this law, which would prevent their making these excavations, and they came down here and asked permission of the Secretary of War to be allowed to excavate. I had supposed up to this time that this thing was simply a blunder of somebody in the War Department. I think now it is perfectly clear that it was a deliberate scheme on the part of a few people who wanted to monopolize the whole of those rich gold-bearing sands, that they found this section of the statute, and choose to put a construction upon it which no court will put upon it, and which I do not believe the Senator from Montana himself will say that any Senator would put upon it, to wit, that it should cover and protect from excavation the sands along all the coasts of the country.

I wish to read that section of the statute again, and to call the special attention of Senators to it. It is as follows:

It shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any other manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater, or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, etc.

Will any man say that this piece of open coast line is either a port or a roadstead?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Why not a roadstead?

Mr. LODGE. Why not a roadstead?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Because, being between the low-water mark and 500 feet below, it is utterly impossible for it to be a roadstead. You could not make a roadstead of it or conceive it to be a roadstead. A roadstead goes farther out to sea. A roadstead never comes within 500 feet of the shore line, because it is very shallow and it is utterly impossible to have a boat on it. I do not believe it is possible for that sort of construction to be put on that at all, but I do believe that this section of the statute was picked out as a pretext for the purpose of enabling these people, who wanted to monopolize all of this gold-bearing sand, to do so. They came down and got their permits from the Secretary, and one of which went to the extent of 2 miles away from the river, not touching the channel of the river, not going anywhere where this law would apply, and running 2 miles up the coast line. Then he will claim that every other man who chooses to shovel a shovelful of sand within those 2 miles is a trespasser, because he has not the permission of the Secretary of War. He therefore makes it his own and holds it.

After this had gone on some time it seems the Secretary of War put into another permit, application for which came along afterwards, that it was not exclusive; that he himself had the right to allow other people to go there, but that they could not go there unless they had the right from him. It seems to me to be the most unfair proposition I ever heard of to undertake to make this law, which was never intended to apply to such a situation as this, but was intended to protect the navigable waters of the United States, apply to a condition of this kind.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, with some of the observations of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] I personally am in agreement. It is a fact, however, that for months and months citizens of the Cape Nome district have been actively urging upon Congress and upon those of us who come from mining States some legislation—the devising of some method whereby this soil and the deposits under the low-water mark could be worked. I agree, and so I have no doubt the Secretary of War would agree, that any attempt by the summoning of this statute to his assistance to give to anybody an exclusive mining right would be in violation of law and unjustifiable.

Perhaps he might have met it. The obvious way to meet the situation would have been to issue a general proclamation declaring that outside of certain streams, or outside of certain portions of the harbor or the roadstead, the statute should not be deemed and held to apply; but there was an excellent reason for not doing this. That reason was that in the crowd and press of people in that district, where the law is imperfectly administered, where they are not yet enjoying a civil government, it might have led to friction and to trouble and to all sorts of contests and injury. There is land enough up there that is rich, I am told, and so I suppose the Secretary of War, to avoid the clashing of interests, sought not to grant exclusive rights, but sought to give everybody the right, and so to cover the ground that there should be as little conflict as possible. That is all. He was working under an imperfect statute concerning a case to which the statute did not apply. But all that the Senator from Arkansas has said is an argument in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. I think all will agree to that.

But, Mr. President, I am compelled to suggest an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana provides that the miners of the mining district may make such rules and regulations as they see fit for governing the working of these deposits. As has been said before, the policy of the law, the open declaration of our statutes, is that the mineral lands of the United States are open to exploration and occupation and possession by all of its citizens or those who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States. This is an anomalous case. All of our mining statutes apply to lodes and to placer claims.

In lode mining the length of the claim is limited to 1,500 feet and its width to 600, but the law gives permission to the States and Territories and the rules of miners in the district to make the parallelogram smaller. The law also limits placer grounds to 20 acres in the possession of one person, or says an association of people may take a hundred and sixty acres, the policy of the law being to limit the mining claim to a small but sufficient area to secure its active development. The policy of this Government is, of course, to get out the precious metals from the earth, and prospecting is encouraged by limiting the area so as not to make it too small, but enough to protect the miner in its use. The law pro-

vides that these rules and customs of miners shall prevail subject to the general law which limits the maximum of the areas.

Now, the amendment of the Senator from Montana says that the rules as to the development of this area shall be in accordance with the rules and customs of miners in the district. If it should be so that but comparatively few people are there now to those who shall come hereafter, and if it should be that the policy of those now upon the ground should be to enlarge greatly the area which might be taken, the policy of our law in that respect might be overridden; and therefore I hope the Senator from Montana will permit an amendment providing that they shall secure the approval of the Secretary of War of the rules and customs of the miners in the district, and which, although, as I have said, the situation is entirely anomalous, shall perhaps as well provide that the rules and regulations for mining shall be, so far as is feasible, in accordance with existing law.

I do not suppose out in the open sea you could limit a man to 20 acres, but you could perhaps limit an association to a hundred and sixty acres. I do not know how they could anchor their claims. The boundaries would be difficult and fluctuating, and yet there ought to be an ability to declare some law that would be, so far as feasible, in accordance with existing statutes, and I do not think the miners of the district ought to arbitrarily make a final rule as to the area, the work required, and the other regulations which shall govern mining, but it should be done by the experts of the Interior Department, until after further investigation and development Congress may pass the necessary legislation.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. What would be the effect of that amendment on the regulations that the miners there have already prescribed and laid down?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The regulations as to mining in any territory where the laws of the United States prevail could not now exceed the existing area, I should think; but this amendment authorizes them to make rules which will arbitrarily govern.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator would then hold that any rule made up to this time—

Mr. WOLCOTT. Must be in accordance with existing law.

Mr. COCKRELL. Could not be in contravention of the provisions of existing law?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. STEWART. I suggest that they would form companies to work in the sea and get 160 acres, and that ought to be ample.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wonder if it is. I do not know how those seas are. I have seen waves that high; they looked so.

Mr. STEWART. I think if the Senator would amend it so that the extent should not exceed—

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me ask the Senator, who is an experienced mining lawyer, whether he does not think the rules and regulations of miners should be first approved and regulated by the Secretary of War, and should be, so far as feasible, in accordance with existing law?

Mr. STEWART. I think you can do it in a word here. I think I would not confine them as to shape, the rectangular shape, by the law.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why not?

Mr. STEWART. I will tell you why. The areas should not exceed a certain maximum. Takes so much front and go on down. Fifteen hundred feet might not be sufficient in length, because the water might be shallow. I would let them vary the shape, but they should not increase the area above that allowed by statute.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me suggest an amendment.

Mr. STEWART. That was very common in California, I will say, where they had a mountain that had an ore bed in the gravel, and they would locate along for miles and miles, so many feet front, running into the hill without limit. They might have so many feet on the beach, running down without limit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As far as the Sandwich Islands?

Mr. STEWART. But the area should not exceed the amount allowed by law—a hundred and sixty acres. They might make it, say, 10 feet wide, and arrange all that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Just keep right around the earth?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And come out at the other end?

Mr. STEWART. Limit the area, but let them fix the shape. I think I can amend it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I suggest this amendment to the consideration of the Senator from Montana and the consideration of the Senate, and let us see if it meets the views of those interested in the mining feature of this bill:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to declare and publish proper rules and regulations whereby the auriferous deposits in Alaska which lie below the low-water mark of the ocean and its tributaries shall, if feasible, be open to exploration and development by citizens of the United States, which said rules and regulations shall, so far as is practicable, be in accordance with existing statutes as applicable to placer mining. The rules and customs of miners in mining district nearest said deposits shall, when not inconsistent with such regulations, be recognized and shall govern the working

of said deposits. The authority of the Secretary of War respecting said auriferous deposits shall be limited to policing the same, and to protecting navigation as he is now by law empowered. Any grants or rights heretofore granted respecting said deposits by any authority are hereby declared void and of no further effect.

Mr. STEWART. The objection to the proposed amendment is that it can not be carried into effect speedily enough. The idea is very good, but we must reflect that there are ten or fifteen thousand people there who must be provided for before the Secretary could get the rules and regulations out there.

Mr. WOLCOTT. You can not telegraph them. Something has got to get there. A fellow has to carry them out. Why could he not carry the regulations out just as well as a copy of the law?

Mr. STEWART. I doubt whether the Secretary will be able to make rules until after he has made further examination. I think very likely he would be as much in the dark about the regulations as we, and if he were to take time, as such officers always do, to correspond, these regulations would not get there for six months or a year after the passage of the act. Many acts have been passed requiring the Secretary to make regulations, and I never knew them to get out inside of six months, and we could not wait for that delay.

I would suggest, and perhaps it can be framed, an amendment to limit the area, and allow the shape to be elastic; and with that addition I think the amendment of the Senator from Montana is perfect.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why not make it a parallelogram of some kind?

Mr. STEWART. Well, a parallelogram.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BACON in the chair). Has the Senator from Colorado offered an amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I do not offer it. I was merely suggesting it to the Senator from Montana; but I apologize for having interfered with his course of conduct of the bill.

Mr. BATE. Is the area indicated in the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I say it shall be as far as practicable in accordance with existing law, and shall be under regulations declared by the Secretary of War, and that, subject to these rules and regulations, the rules and customs of miners shall govern.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised to hear the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] say that it could not be a roadstead because it is within 500 feet of the shore. I know a number of roadsteads which are within my own personal observation every summer where boats ride, and they are roadsteads within 50 yards of the shore and sometimes much nearer. A roadstead—I find my impression is correct—is a place near the shore where vessels may anchor, differing from a harbor in not being sheltered. A roadstead may be an open roadstead, or it may be a sheltered roadstead. Hampton Roads is sheltered, but it may be an open road. It is merely a place where vessels may anchor. That is all it amounts to, and it may be within 500 feet or 500 yards or 2,500 yards. It is a very general expression. There are plenty of places where there are cities with ports which are merely open roads—that is, nothing but the open shore—and the vessel only gets anchorage.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I was not conscious of saying it could not be a roadstead because it was within 500 feet of the shore.

Mr. LODGE. I so understood.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am sure ports may be within 500 feet of the shore. My understanding was that this permit was given to excavate for 500 feet from the shore, because that was about the width in which the sand could be easily reached and from which the water would in great measure recede, and the water would be very shallow in that place, along the coast, and I inferred that it could in no sense be a roadstead. If there is any statement that this is a roadstead, then, of course, the Secretary might have the right to grant these permits, but I do not suppose there is any roadstead or that anybody would say that there is a roadstead on any part of this ground. It would have to appear affirmatively that there is a roadstead before that could be the case. The definition of a roadstead, as I see it in Worcester's Dictionary, is an anchorage at some distance from shore, which, I think, is correct, and which, it seems to me, would not bring any of the proposed territory within this law, as quoted by the Secretary of War.

Mr. LODGE. The only defined point about a roadstead is that it is an anchorage. Judging from the map, there are no harbors within 50 or 60 miles of Cape Nome. There is nothing near the gold-mining strip. They have to take vessels there to land passengers and all that, and if vessels anchor off that region in Cape Nome, as they doubtless will, in order to land passengers and freight and all that, that constitutes it a roadstead.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have no doubt about that, but I had no idea that where a vessel can anchor such permits would be granted.

Mr. LODGE. Anywhere where a vessel can anchor is a roadstead.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. This would not reach any such place.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know about that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I say if it does not, the law does not apply.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the amendment presented by the Senator from Colorado I have read and glanced at merely, but in a general way I may state now the obstacles in the way of Congress in legislating upon this question. It has been held over and over again that the Government of the United States holds the tide lands along the shores of navigable waters of Territories in trust for the future State. We can not without a violation of that trust apply the general mining laws in such manner as to attempt to give a fee-simple title to the locator. This rule would apply not only to tide lands, but to the lands beyond the tide or low mean tide mark. The amendment pending provides for only temporary possession by the miners. It avoids reference to the mining laws because of the apprehension that by some course of construction it might hereafter be contended that title could be obtained to the tide lands under the general mining laws of the United States.

This amendment as presented merely grants unrestrained permission to miners to temporarily explore and possess these tide lands and shallow waters for mining purposes until otherwise provided by law. We allow a mere easement. It is true that in the enjoyment of the easement the estate may be to some extent despoiled, but we do not pretend to give a fee-simple title, nor do we use any language calculated so to imply. I believe that in the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado we might at some time in the future encounter construction which would lead to widespread litigation relative to this trust property. I think we ought to hold the trust sacred. Yet we are confronted by a condition where hundreds and thousands of our citizens are going forth to explore that country for gold, and it is the desire that we should permit them to go unrestrained upon the tide lands and over the shallow waters for that purpose.

In the Seattle tide-land cases the Supreme Court of the United States held that the land within the limits of the tide flats was not subject to disposition by Congress. We do not pretend to dispose of the fee or of the soil, but to permit a mere temporary use of both. I believe it is better to leave the disposition of matters of detail to the miners on the ground than to undertake to allow a clerk in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, 6,000 miles away, to deal with conditions of which he has little or no knowledge. From last December until this the residents of Alaska district have been importuning Congress to pass some law which would govern and regulate the operations of miners on the tide lands. We have steadily refrained from attempting any legislation, because of a lack of knowledge concerning the subject. In our ignorance of what to do we might do that which would trouble the miners there and come back to trouble us here.

This amendment transfers from Congress to the American citizens directly in charge of the subject the power, which is but temporary, to govern and control their workings from day to day. No title can be obtained save of a possessory kind. That title the miners may provide, and I believe will provide, shall hang from day to day upon the possession of the individual in the actual work of mining. It would be a calamity; it would be an injury and an injustice to the prospectors in the country to permit A, B, C, and D, under general rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, to stake out a portion of the shallow water and tide lands and then move back into the States after performing trifling assessment work. It is an inclement climate. It is not a pleasant place to remain any great length of time, if all reports be true, or if half of what is said be true.

The miner will go there by the earliest boat moving out from Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, or San Francisco; will press his way through the gorging ice of Bering Sea and reach the gold coast of Cape Nome. He will desire to go to work at once. Not a day can he afford to lose, because the summer will be short and a severe winter will drive him home. In the meantime, Mr. President, he will meet others situated exactly as he is situated; he will meet these other men from everywhere—from the States and Territories of the Union—men familiar with miners' meanings, men familiar with their system of legislating, and in the meeting which will result from common impulse rules and regulations will be evolved permeated with justice and specially suited to the situation.

Mr. COCKRELL. When is that meeting to be held?

Mr. CARTER. That meeting comes together in a mining camp as naturally as the rain falls from the sky.

Mr. COCKRELL. Suppose that, as soon as this bill passes, there are, say, fifty or a hundred men there on the ground. They immediately hold a meeting and lay down their rules and regulations to suit themselves only. What will become of the others who may come there?

Mr. CARTER. There is no place in this world where true democracy so prevails without taint of any sort as in a mining camp. The majority rules. Laws are modified and holdings are limited, claims are reduced according to the supreme will of the majority. And when the larger crowd come in and find upon

the records of the miners' meetings of days or weeks before some rules or regulations in the interest of a job or a clique, they will assemble and wipe out such rules without ceremony or faltering. That is the way they do it. The Senator from Nevada knows of that. He passed through the early days of Nevada and California. My colleague, the Senator from Montana, knows of it, as does the senior Senator from Colorado. A dozen witnesses in this Chamber can bear testimony to the fact that in the miners' meeting you get the quintessence of simple justice.

The junior Senator from Colorado would transfer this to an \$1,800 clerk in the Interior Department, who I am sure does not know as much about it as any Senator in this Chamber, and there is not a Senator in the Chamber to-day who would dare sit down at his desk and attempt to prescribe rules and regulations to govern conditions of which he has only speculative knowledge. I think the amendment presented here may well and safely be adopted. I think its operation will prove satisfactory. The Senator from Nevada suggests, as does the Senator from Colorado, that we might provide that in no case shall rules and regulations allow the possession of a larger area than that prescribed by the placer-mining laws of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is not that right?

Mr. CARTER. I think the Senator from Nevada is preparing such an amendment. I will gladly accept it, because it will be a limitation in the right direction. It will fix the maximum and the miners will fix the minimum.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator give us some information on this matter, if he has it? I have seen it in the papers somewhere, I do not recall where—I am interested in this matter only as one Senator here who has been listening to the debate—that the holders of these permits from the Secretary of War had been subletting them by issuing licenses to men at so much a day or something like that, and all others are arrested by the soldiers—Uncle Sam's bluecoats—who are there. If that be true, it would follow that anything the miners might do in a public meeting would have no effect upon the War Department.

Mr. CARTER. If the Senator will permit me a moment, by referring to the document he will find that these permits were issued at a recent date. It will be impossible for any human being to reach the country to which they refer before the 1st day of next June.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; it was last fall that I saw the statement about the soldiers arresting men who did not hold permits of the licenses, licenses, or permits that had been granted by the War Department.

Mr. CARTER. There were no permits granted. I will state, however—

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator allow me? I suggest an amendment to his amendment, to insert after the word "law:"

Provided, That the rules and regulations of miners shall not authorize larger claims than are allowed by the placer-mining laws of the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I desire to say a word or two in reference to some of the remarks which the Senator from Montana has made respecting this measure. It disturbs me to be compelled to differ with him upon any of the features of this bill concerning Alaska, over which he has spent so much time and which he has so intelligently presented to the Senate, but I hope Senators will consider before they vote on this amendment. When it comes to dealing with the waters of the United States below low-water mark, I think the executive department of the Government should supervise the rules and regulations touching its development. I do not think it should be left to the miners at miners' meetings to declare areas or to declare rules, except subject to the approval of the Government.

It is common and it is unjust to talk about an \$1,800 clerk determining the action of one of the great Executive Departments of the Government. The amendment I offered was that the Secretary of the Interior should prescribe the rules and regulations governing the working of these claims. The Senator from Montana assumes that that means an \$1,800 clerk. He served for three years as Commissioner of the General Land Office of the United States, and we had some very important promulgations of rules very ably done. Were they done by an \$1,800 clerk?

Mr. CARTER. Well, generally so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If they were, an \$1,800 clerk is very competent to deal with this question. But I know they were not. They were done by the Senator from Montana. Our officers who administer the affairs of that Department of the Government are able and intelligent.

The only suggestion I have heard that would militate at all respecting this amendment is the question of time. If the pressure is great, the Department will act with promptitude. I have no question, Mr. President, that everybody will be more contented

if the Government of the United States here holds its hand upon the final control of the rules and regulations which may be made for working those claims. I therefore feel impelled to offer the following as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Montana. I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to declare and publish proper rules and regulations whereby the auriferous deposits in Alaska which lie below the low-water mark of the ocean and its tributaries shall, if feasible, be open to exploration and development by citizens of the United States, or those who have declared their intention of becoming such citizens, which said rules and regulations shall, so far as is practicable, be in accordance with existing statutes as applicable to placer mining, and shall limit the area of each claim to the acreage now allowed by law.

The rules and customs of miners in the mining district nearest said deposits shall, when not inconsistent with such regulations, be recognized, and shall govern the working of said deposits.

The authority of the Secretary of War respecting said auriferous deposits shall be limited to policing the same and to protecting navigation, as he is now by law empowered.

Any grants or rights heretofore granted respecting said deposits by any authority are hereby declared void and of no further effect.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana (Mr. CARTER) ought to prevail. I had some little experience about these matters in old times. The miners, as the Senator from Montana says, are about as just a set of men as I have ever seen assembled together. Rough, self-willed, they govern themselves by a vote of the mining camp. They will govern themselves in that same way in spite of any enactment that we make here, and they govern as justly as Congress could possibly do. They submit to the ruling of the majority. It is a rough rule, but, as a general thing, so far as I have ever observed, and I had more than two years' experience with them as a part of them. They administered their own laws fairly and equally, and they punished the man who violated them with a promptness that would be worthy of all imitation in the courts of the United States. It was done promptly. It is true there was not very much of the statute law in their conduct.

But what the Senator from Montana is aiming at is the right thing to do, because we ought to give sanction to a good government wherever we find it, and we ought to make that lawful which will take place whether you make it or not. Remember that the miners are separated from all other communities; they are off by themselves; they are a community to themselves; they are not interfering with people at a distance; they are not interfering with what is taking place 5 miles off. Their rules have no influence or control, except that they might be imitated. Mr. President, I want the amendment of the Senator from Montana to pass because it is going to be the law in Alaska whether you pass it or not, and I want their conduct to be lawful.

Mr. BATE. In view of what has been said, as many of us know nothing about mining interests or the mode of operating them and want to do what is right in this matter, I think it is proper now to have the amendment of the Senator from Montana read in connection with the one which has just been read, so that we may understand the question clearly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee calls for the reading of the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. It will be read.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest that in that connection the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], which tends to perfect the amendment offered by me, should be read. I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. It is, after the word "law," to insert the following:

Provided, That the rules and regulations established by the miners shall not allow the location of mining claims larger in area than placer claims under the laws of the United States.

Mr. CARTER. I accept that, and it may be read in connection with and as part of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment of the Senator from Montana as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, at the end of section 26, insert the following:

Provided further, That, subject only to such general limitations as may be necessary to exempt navigation from artificial obstructions, all land and shoal water below mean high tide on the shores, bays, and inlets of Bering Sea within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be subject to exploration for gold and other precious metals by citizens of the United States, or persons who have legally declared their intentions to become such, under such reasonable rules and regulations as the miners in organized mining districts may have heretofore made, or may hereafter make governing the temporary possession thereof for exploration and mining purposes, until otherwise provided by law: *Provided further*, That the rules and regulations established by the miners shall not allow the location of mining claims larger in area than placer claims under the laws of the United States, and all permits heretofore granted authorizing any person or persons, corporation or company to excavate or mine under any of said waters are hereby revoked and declared null and void.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have offered a substitute, which I ask may be read, so that the two may be compared together, and then I shall ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to declare and publish proper rules and regulations whereby the auriferous deposits in Alaska which lie below the low-water mark of the ocean and its tributaries shall, if feasible, be open to exploration and development by citizens of the United States or those who have declared their intention of becoming such citizens, which said rules and regulations shall, so far as is practicable, be in accordance with existing statutes as applicable to placer mining, and shall limit the area of each claim to the acreage now allowed by law.

The rules and customs of miners in the mining district nearest said deposits shall, when not inconsistent with such regulations, be recognized, and shall govern the working of said deposits.

The authority of the Secretary of War respecting said auriferous deposits shall be limited to policing the same, and to protecting navigation as he is now by law empowered.

Any grants or rights heretofore granted respecting said deposits by any authority are hereby declared void and of no further effect.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I much prefer the amendment of the Senator from Montana for several reasons. One is that much time will necessarily be consumed before any regulation can be made, and that will be very prejudicial, inasmuch as there is a large immigration now rushing there, and it is imperative to have at once law and order and the ascertainment of rights. Besides, I believe in leaving as much of the regulation and government of the people to themselves as possible. I have seen a good deal of what has occurred where the people made their own rules and regulations. In September, 1850, the question came up, What shall be done with the California miners?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President—

Mr. STEWART. Do not interrupt me now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. STEWART. No; not now.

Mr. LINDSAY. I only want to ask a question.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to be asked a question now. I want to finish.

Mr. LINDSAY. All right.

Mr. STEWART. The question came up in the Senate of the United States what to do, and there was quite a discussion as to rules and regulations for leasing the mining land, etc. Finally it was suggested by Mr. Benton, and Mr. Seward concurred, and so did Governor Chase, who was in the Senate at the time, and after a colloquial discussion had gone on in the Senate, they concluded to let the miners alone. They were let alone for about twenty years. They built up a system of laws, and they met every emergency reasonably well. They made their own rules and regulations. Finally, after a lapse of about twenty years, those rules and regulations were adopted by Congress and they are now the law of the land, Congress making some maximum limitations and providing for obtaining patents, but still adopting the rules and regulations. That was done in 1866. Then it was perfected in 1872 as it now stands.

At that time there was a strong desire to have the law administered here. Those of us who live in that country contended, and contended very strenuously, that inasmuch as we were adopting the miners' laws we ought to leave the administration, the ascertainment of the right of possession, to local authority. So it was provided that the local court should have jurisdiction; that wherever there was a contest the case should be tried before the local court, and only that should come up here. It was intended that all the Department would have to do with it would be merely administrative. It is impossible for any person here, however intelligent, who has not been a part of the creation of those laws to administer them. The miners know a good deal more there than the lawyers do here about the laws, their application, and whether they are beneficial or otherwise. Even as to the regulations, they will make better regulations than can be made here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let me ask the Senator if he did not help devise the present mining law?

Mr. STEWART. I did.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And advocate it?

Mr. STEWART. I did.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then what is the matter with it?

Mr. STEWART. I drew it. What is the matter with it? It is a good law. Of course it is a good law if I drew it. I worked hard to procure it. That law recognizes the rules and regulations of the miners and enacts them into law. Congress did make more rules and regulations, but they are based on those. Their right to legislate is preserved in that law right through, and it has been most beneficial.

It has been so beneficial that there has been no disposition to change it. There has been no power to change it. Whenever there is any attempt to change it, even in some little matters where it is thought it would be proper to make a change, we find the people so jealous of it that they come in and protest. They are satisfied with it; it is based on their rules and regulations. That is the basis of it. I recollect very well when a case was before the Supreme Court whether there was any property involved, so as to give the United States courts jurisdiction. I simply stated the case and nothing else. I showed what we had done, and, in opposition to everybody, the court said they could not

shut their eyes to what had occurred for twenty years of nonaction by the Government, and they affirmed it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada will suspend one moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

Mr. STEWART. Just one minute. Let me finish a sentence.

Mr. FORAKER. I will yield for a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business will be laid aside for a moment.

Mr. STEWART. The court recognized the persons who had gone there as trespassers as having legal rights contrary to law on account of what had grown up. So I think we had better trust the people. Inasmuch as the amendment of the Senator from Montana is in line with what has been so thoroughly successful, I am disposed to follow that Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will be compelled to ask the indulgence of the Senator from Ohio for a few moments. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

In further response to the resolution of the Senate of January 17, 1900, requesting copies of communications between the Executive Departments of the Government and Aguinaldo or other persons undertaking to represent the people in arms against the United States in the Philippine Islands, together with other official documents relating to the Philippine Islands, and the conduct and events of the insurrection against the authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, and having reference to my message to the Senate of March 5, 1900 (Senate Document, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, No. 208), and that paragraph of the resolution of January 17, 1900, reading as follows:

"And that the President be further requested to communicate, without delay, so much of such information as is now in his possession, or in that of any Department at Washington, without waiting to obtain so much of said information as may require considerable delay or communication with the Philippine Islands, and to communicate the remainder of the information as soon thereafter as it can be obtained."

I transmit herewith the following additional papers:

First. Copies of English translations of minutes of insurgent meetings held at Hongkong, China, February 24 and May 5, 1898, respectively, and of a certain other paper, appended hereto, marked "I," said documents being found in insurgent public records recently captured by our troops in the Philippine Islands.

Second. Copies of documents containing information of the treatment of prisoners, either Spanish or American, by the people in arms against the authority of the United States. Said copies of documents are appended hereto, marked "II."

Third. Copies of papers and documents, or English translations of the same, found in insurgent records recently captured by our troops in the Philippine Islands, containing information as to aid or encouragement received by Aguinaldo and his followers from persons in the United States; as to what pamphlets, speeches, or other documents emanating from the United States and adverse to its authority and to its policy were circulated in whole or in part among the Filipinos in arms against the United States, among the other inhabitants of the islands, or among the soldiers of the United States. Said copies of documents are appended hereto and marked "III."

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 27, 1900.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 240) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wakefield;

A bill (H. R. 301) granting a pension to James T. Donaldson, jr.;

A bill (H. R. 457) granting a pension to Clara L. Harriman;

A bill (H. R. 493) granting a pension to Fanny M. Hays;

A bill (H. R. 548) granting a pension to Edward Harris;

A bill (H. R. 625) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Reed;

A bill (H. R. 642) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Doolittle;

A bill (H. R. 657) granting a pension to Francis A. Kitchen;

A bill (H. R. 737) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Middleton;

A bill (H. R. 741) granting an increase of pension to Zedock C. Andrews;

A bill (H. R. 1147) granting an increase of pension to Luke H. Cooper;

A bill (H. R. 1172) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 1677) granting an increase of pension to Missouri B. Ross;

A bill (H. R. 1681) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Locke;

A bill (H. R. 1800) granting a pension to Lutheria H. Maynard;

A bill (H. R. 1946) granting a pension to Jane F. Chalmers;

A bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to Horace N. Brackett;

A bill (H. R. 2203) granting an increase of pension to John M. Garrett;

A bill (H. R. 2397) granting a pension to Eliza S. Redfield;
 A bill (H. R. 2623) granting a pension to Melville Oliphant;
 A bill (H. R. 2728) granting a pension to Thomas T. Garrison;
 A bill (H. R. 2748) granting an increase of pension to Henry Schnetberg;
 A bill (H. R. 2909) granting an increase of pension to George M. Brown;
 A bill (H. R. 3021) granting a pension to Eliza H. Getchel;
 A bill (H. R. 3131) granting a pension to Matilda O'Connor;
 A bill (H. R. 3214) granting a pension to John S. Dukate;
 A bill (H. R. 3225) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bent Cooper;
 A bill (H. R. 3268) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kessler;
 A bill (H. R. 3307) granting a pension to Matilda Hennessy;
 A bill (H. R. 3312) granting an increase of pension to Ellen V. Myer;
 A bill (H. R. 3454) granting a pension to Joseph E. Baldwin;
 A bill (H. R. 3563) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Floyd;
 A bill (H. R. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Timothy B. Eastman;
 A bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus Lavine;
 A bill (H. R. 3654) granting a pension to Calvin E. Myers;
 A bill (H. R. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Sanford;
 A bill (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Ricketts;
 A bill (H. R. 3775) granting an increase of pension to Robert Boston;
 A bill (H. R. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Frances D. Best;
 A bill (H. R. 3869) granting a pension to Joseph H. Hamrick and Ella G. Hamrick;
 A bill (H. R. 3941) granting a pension to Samuel B. Weeks;
 A bill (H. R. 3962) granting an increase of pension to Alanson C. Eberhart;
 A bill (H. R. 4030) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Coleman;
 A bill (H. R. 4089) granting a pension to Emily Burke;
 A bill (H. R. 4138) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Hyatt;
 A bill (H. R. 4180) granting an increase of pension to Austin J. Pickett;
 A bill (H. R. 4247) granting an increase of pension to Francis S. Wolfe;
 A bill (H. R. 4267) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Bennett;
 A bill (H. R. 4276) granting an increase of pension to John R. Eggeman;
 A bill (H. R. 4398) granting a pension to Julius Vogt;
 A bill (H. R. 4562) granting a pension to Lois A. Fields;
 A bill (H. R. 4654) granting an increase of pension to Simon Van Der Vaart;
 A bill (H. R. 4657) granting a pension to Laura S. Pontious;
 A bill (H. R. 4675) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Jones;
 A bill (H. R. 4681) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Keiff;
 A bill (H. R. 4696) granting an increase of pension to Ruthven W. Houghton;
 A bill (H. R. 4791) granting a pension to Catharine A. Schwunger;
 A bill (H. R. 4805) granting a pension to Isaac Price;
 A bill (H. R. 4828) granting a pension to Susie E. Johnson;
 A bill (H. R. 4832) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Graves;
 A bill (H. R. 4991) granting a pension to Maria V. Sperry;
 A bill (H. R. 5088) granting an increase of pension to William G. Willoughby;
 A bill (H. R. 5110) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Kennedy;
 A bill (H. R. 5127) granting a pension to John Lafollett;
 A bill (H. R. 5134) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Allison;
 A bill (H. R. 5169) granting an increase of pension to Charles Weed;
 A bill (H. R. 5170) granting a pension to Cyrus Johnson;
 A bill (H. R. 5171) granting an increase of pension to William R. Wallace;
 A bill (H. R. 5209) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Greeley;
 A bill (H. R. 5211) granting a pension to Lizzie M. Dixon;
 A bill (H. R. 5435) granting an increase of pension to Alexander P. Baugher;
 A bill (H. R. 5586) granting a pension to William H. Lane;
 A bill (H. R. 5961) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Hausman;
 A bill (H. R. 5979) granting a pension to Phebe S. Riley;

A bill (H. R. 6019) granting a pension to Mrs. Therese W. Hard;
 A bill (H. R. 6089) granting a pension to Alfred T. Moreland;
 A bill (H. R. 6159) granting an increase of pension to Arnold Bloom;
 A bill (H. R. 6195) granting a pension to Livingston B. Gregory;
 A bill (H. R. 6304) granting an increase of pension to James J. Lyons;
 A bill (H. R. 6372) granting a pension to Abbie E. Webster;
 A bill (H. R. 6375) granting an increase of pension to Chester Willis;
 A bill (H. R. 6486) granting an increase of pension to Orange F. Berden;
 A bill (H. R. 6624) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bradley;
 A bill (H. R. 6731) granting an increase of pension to William F. Tait;
 A bill (H. R. 6784) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Neff;
 A bill (H. R. 6785) granting an increase of pension to Maria Egan;
 A bill (H. R. 6885) granting a pension to Horace B. Durant;
 A bill (H. R. 6900) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Kurtz;
 A bill (H. R. 6952) granting a pension to Carrie P. Dale;
 A bill (H. R. 6995) granting a pension to Catharine Harris;
 A bill (H. R. 7177) granting an increase of pension to John N. Breed;
 A bill (H. R. 7488) granting a pension to John C. Ray;
 A bill (H. R. 7535) granting an increase of pension to Clare H. Burleigh;
 A bill (H. R. 7596) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Wight;
 A bill (H. R. 7599) granting an increase of pension to John F. Crawford;
 A bill (H. R. 7767) granting a pension to Alice D. Roatch;
 A bill (H. R. 7799) granting an increase of pension to Franklin M. Burdoin;
 A bill (H. R. 8045) granting an increase of pension to Wilford Cooper;
 A bill (H. R. 8079) granting a pension to Bertha M. Jordan;
 A bill (H. R. 8083) granting an increase of pension to James Winnie;
 A bill (H. R. 8112) granting a pension to John Vogler;
 A bill (H. R. 8120) granting an increase of pension to David L. Wentworth;
 A bill (H. R. 8339) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Gates;
 A bill (H. R. 8378) granting an increase of pension to Mary Steffens;
 A bill (H. R. 8390) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Mitchell;
 A bill (H. R. 8395) granting an increase of pension to Henry Johns;
 A bill (H. R. 8405) granting a pension to Sophronia Seely;
 A bill (H. R. 8599) granting a pension to Ellen J. Williams;
 A bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to Joseph Champlin Stone;
 A bill (H. R. 8610) granting an increase of pension to Abner S. Crawford;
 A bill (H. R. 8669) granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Lake;
 A bill (H. R. 8800) granting an increase of pension to Bell Fries; and
 A bill (H. R. 9070) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Kent.
 The bill (H. R. 5552) for the relief of Northup & Chick, and also of Thomas N. Stinson, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
 The bill (H. R. 6240) for the preparation of plans or designs for a memorial or statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on ground belonging to the United States Government in the city of Washington, D. C., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.
 The bill (H. R. 6344) to remove the charge of desertion from the records of the War Department against Frederick Mehning was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.
 The bill (H. R. 7939) to amend an act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.
 H. K. CARROLL'S REPORT ON PUERTO RICO.
 Mr. COCKRELL. I hold in my hand a document entitled "Report on the island of Porto Rico; its population, civil government, commerce, industry, productions, roads, tariff, and currency, with recommendations, by Henry K. Carroll, special commissioner for the United States to Porto Rico. Respectfully

submitted to Hon. William McKinley, President of the United States, October 6, 1899. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899." "Treasury Department, Document No. 2118. Office of the Secretary."

This document has never been furnished to Congress, so far as I have been able to discover. It has never been in our document room. I think if it is of such value as to justify a special commissioner to go there and collate these data and submit them to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, and to have the Government pay for its publication, it ought to be published so that it may reach at least Congress and all its members.

I therefore ask that 3,000 copies of this document shall be printed for the use of Congress, 1,000 of which shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the House. I will prepare a resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator any idea what the cost might be?

Mr. COCKRELL. I have sent for Mr. Smith, the Printing Office clerk, who can tell us, hoping that he would get here before I had to call it up. If it costs over \$500, it will have to be a concurrent resolution. If it costs under \$500, the Senate can pass a simple Senate resolution. I will make the resolution to correspond with the cost. I will get the information in a few minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will present the resolution later on, then.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. COCKRELL subsequently said: I submit a resolution which I prepared after consultation as to the cost of the document. We can print 1,200 copies for \$500 or less.

The order was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered by the Senate, That there be printed for the use of the Senate and placed in the Senate document room, 1,200 copies of "The report on the island of Porto Rico; its population, civil government, commerce, industries, productions, roads, tariff, and currency, with recommendations, by Henry K. Carroll, special commissioner for the United States to Porto Rico. Respectfully submitted to Hon. William McKinley, President of the United States, October 6, 1899."

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHOUP submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6627) "making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreements to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 7, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"And provided further, That the report of such examining surgeons shall specifically state the rating which in their judgment the applicant is entitled to, and the report of such examining surgeons shall specifically and accurately set forth the physical condition of the applicant, each and every existing disability being fully and carefully described."

"The reports of the special examiners of the Bureau of Pensions shall be open to inspection and copy by the applicant or his attorney, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Interior may prescribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE L. SHOUP,
J. V. QUARLES,
JAMES P. TALLAFERRO,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
S. S. BARNEY,
J. T. McCLEARY,
JOHN C. BELL,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT FOR PUERTO RICO.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, before proceeding with the consideration of the unfinished business, I think I should state to Senators that I have concluded not to ask a separation of the two propositions—one the House bill and the other the Senate substitute providing a civil government for Puerto Rico—but have concluded to proceed with the unfinished business in the state in which it is. In order that Senators might be fully advised as to the committee amendments, about which there was some complaint made the other day—in a good-natured way, of course—I had the bill reprinted, so as to show in the text all the amendments which have been adopted by the Senate, and also to show, in the way indicated in the note at the head of the bill, the amendments yet to be proposed, upon which I shall ask the judgment of the Senate as rapidly as they can be considered.

I understand the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] desires to speak on this bill. I do not know to what particular point he desires to speak; but there is one amendment under consideration, which has been discussed to some extent, which I should like to have disposed of. Still if the Senator would prefer to speak first, I will yield to him.

Mr. STEWART. I will make what remarks I have to make now. Mr. FORAKER. Very well; then I will yield to the Senator at this time to submit his remarks.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like, if I may be permitted, to offer an amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I should have called the attention of Senators to the fact that each Senator will find on his desk the reprint of the bill in the form which I have indicated.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to offer and to have pending the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is now an amendment pending. The Senator can have his amendment printed and have it lie on the table.

Mr. ALLEN. Can there not be more than one amendment pending at the same time to different parts of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No two amendments can be actually pending at the same time. The Senator's amendment will be printed and lie on the table, subject to his call.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, has the expenditure of blood and treasure in the Spanish war and in the war with the Filipinos been a criminal blunder? Will Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines, if acquired and held by the United States, be a blessing or a curse? Will William McKinley be regarded by posterity as a benefactor for adding to the United States islands abounding in tropical products, or will he be execrated for a criminal attempt to subvert the Constitution and injure the industries of the people by the acquisition of pestiferous, poisonous, and worthless lands beyond the sea? These questions are now being discussed in the public press, in the pulpit, and at the firesides of the people.

The same sentimentality and narrow prejudice which embittered the discussion in the time of Jefferson, Monroe, and Polk, on account of the acquisitions of territory made by them, are potent factors in the opposition to the acquisition of the most productive and valuable islands in all the seas. Such opposition was anticipated. Fault-finders as well as broad-minded and practical citizens are the outgrowth of free institutions.

ELEMENTS WARRING AGAINST NATURAL GROWTH.

Unfortunately, there are other elements warring against natural growth and expansion which never before appeared in discussions of this character. No agricultural interest ever before opposed the acquisition of more good land because it would produce what the people consumed at less cost than any land hitherto owned by the United States. The Louisiana purchase and the territories acquired from Spain and Mexico were much better adapted to the production of many farm products than the States of the Northeast, but no one opposed those acquisitions because the land was too good. The sentimental objectors contended that the land was worthless for any purpose whatever.

The strange phase of the present controversy is the opposition of the sugar and tobacco interests. It is asserted that those commodities can be produced in these islands for less than one-half the expenditure required in their production in other sections of the United States. This argument is about as reasonable as it would have been for Massachusetts to have opposed the Jefferson purchase because it would cheapen breadstuffs. Would the great mass of the people of the United States be injured if what the advocates of the sugar interests assert were true? If the price of sugar could be reduced 50 per cent, would the poor complain? The people of the United States are now compelled to pay to foreigners between ninety-five and one hundred million dollars annually for sugar which they could produce themselves if the islands wrested from Spain were in the peaceable possession of the United States. A protective tariff is maintained for the purpose of encouraging home production by keeping out foreign sugar. Why not protect the sugar growers of this country by the acquisition of islands where our people can produce sugar at less cost than any other people on the face of the globe? These arguments apply equally to the production of tobacco and all other commodities which are the natural growth of the new acquisitions.

THE ISLANDS FURNISH RICH MARKETS.

The export of gold, so long as that commodity is the only material upon which money can be stamped, is a standing menace to the business of the country and is watched with more anxiety than any other cause affecting the price of property. The buying of tropical products in foreign lands now absorbs more than two hundred and fifty millions of our annual exports. If this ever-increasing obligation to foreigners could be avoided by the production of tropical products in our island possessions, the United States would have the advantage, both financially and commercially, of any other country on earth. The people could then produce everything they consume, except luxuries to indulge the pride and vanity of the rich.

These islands, notwithstanding the robbery, tyranny, and extortion of Spanish misrule, imported annually more than \$120,000,000 in value of foreign merchandise. It would be safe to anticipate with honest and stable government that American enterprise and

capital would increase the consuming capacity of the islands more than fourfold, and the people of the United States would in the near future enjoy a market of from three hundred to five hundred millions a year for their surplus manufactures and farm products, and they would receive in exchange tropical products of equal value, including sugar, tobacco, and many other staple commodities.

Would not such a market furnish more employment for labor and benefit the farming and manufacturing interests of the country more than can possibly be done by tariff walls to force the production of tobacco and sugar on land designed by nature for the cultivation of the cereals, fruits, grasses, and other products of the temperate zone? Why turn these islands over to anarchy, discord, and ruin, or, what would be more injurious to the United States, to be occupied and their resources developed by some European power which would take advantage of their great productive capacity to compete with the tariff-nursed sugar and tobacco of the United States? Why should anyone argue that cheap sugar and tobacco produced in our own country would injure our consumers, or that the vast demand for our manufactures and farm products in these islands would be prejudicial to the laboring man by diminishing his opportunities for employment?

TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENTS ADAPTED TO ISLANDS.

No promise has been made and no obligation will exist to create States in these islands until such time as the people shall determine through their representatives in Congress that new States beyond the seas would be beneficial to the United States. No reasonable person will pretend that our successors will not be as wise and patriotic as ourselves. No one denies that Congress has power to do many harmful things which might subvert the Government, but if the time ever arrives when patriotism is dead in the Congress of the United States, the danger of admitting new States will not be the most alarming danger.

Our Territorial forms of government, which have grown and developed with the growth and development of the country, are admirably suited to the government of these islands. It is the established practice of our Government to accord to the Territories as much self-government as they are capable of enjoying. Although by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo the United States agreed to form States out of the newly acquired territory, New Mexico has remained for more than fifty years under a Territorial form of government. The greater part of Alaska, measured by the time of communication, is vastly more remote than the Philippines. Congress has no difficulty in governing Alaska and applying to it so much of our Territorial system as circumstances justify. The only voice a Territory has in the government of the country is the voice of advice and consultation through a Delegate elected by the people, who has no vote in Congress.

The natives of these islands at the time of the acquisition from Spain will never be citizens of the United States without the action of Congress. The treaty with Spain expressly referred the matter of citizenship to Congress. But it can make no difference whether or not they are citizens; they will have no power to injure the Government of the United States until they have a voice in that Government by the admission of their islands as States. The citizenship of persons born in the islands after the acquisition can not injure our Government as long as such persons are not allowed to participate in its control.

NO FEAR OF CHINESE COMPETITION.

The attempt to alarm the laborers of this country by the false assertion that the acquisition of these islands will let in Chinese laborers is demagogism. Our exclusion laws apply to Chinese from whatever country they may come. The law that excludes Chinese immigration to this country can be made applicable to all our possessions and the Chinese residents of the Philippines may be treated in the same manner as the Chinese residents of the United States.

The suggestion that laborers from the islands who are not Chinese may migrate to this country and compete with American labor has no foundation to support it. Nature marks the line which laboring migration must follow. Witness our own country. The Swedes and the Norwegians find congenial homes along the Northern Lakes and Canadian borders. Germans follow along a little farther south. The Irish prefer the central regions of the United States as corresponding more nearly to the climate of their native land. The Italians generally go farther south and on the Pacific coast to find climatic conditions similar to balmy Italy. Never in all the ages has the population of the Tropics crossed the isothermal lines to inhabit and cultivate the soil of the temperate zones, nor have laborers from the north succeeded in cultivating tropical lands. Merchants, traders, bankers, and business men readily accommodate themselves to the climate of the torrid, temperate, or frigid zone. Business and professional men from the north enjoy southern climes, and the same is true of business and professional men of the south when they emigrate to the north. Successful labor follows but does not cross the line separating the tropical from the temperate zone.

MUTUAL BENEFITS RESULTING FROM RETENTION OF ISLANDS.

The resources of the United States in everything found in the temperate zones are inexhaustible and practically untouched. Modern machinery and the genius of American people can always produce more of the products and manufactures of the temperate zone than the people can use. These islands under American control and enterprise will produce vastly more tropical products than they can consume. The interchange of the products of the farm, the mine, and the factory for the sugar, coffee, tobacco, fruits, and other products of these islands will give employment to millions in the United States as well as in the islands. The storm of criticism and the rancorous vituperation of disappointed ambition will soon pass away, and when the American people are in full enjoyment of the new acquisitions they will view them as serenely and with as much satisfaction as they now contemplate the teeming population and the wonderful productions of the countries acquired during the Administrations of Jefferson, Monroe, and Polk, and posterity will wonder why anybody could have opposed the rich inheritance which the war against Spanish cruelty brought to the United States, as they now wonder why it was that the acquisitions of territory which we have heretofore made were opposed by persons otherwise considered sane and sensible.

The establishment of self-government and the inauguration of industry under the benign influence of the principles of the Declaration of Independence in the gems of the sea, which good fortune has placed within the reach of the American people, are delayed and embarrassed by the timidity of the friends of expansion and progress. The suggestion that there is some nebulous, open-door policy in the far East which would prevent the United States from extending our customs laws over the Philippines is a dream of folly which will not disturb the American people. The idea that the United States will hold the Philippines and maintain their ports free to all the world and at the same time separate them from our country by a tariff wall which would exclude them from our markets and deprive us of the benefit of their trade can not be seriously considered.

The contention that any of the islands which we wrested from Spanish rule would injure American industries on account of their productions is a pure invention. Some gentlemen seem to regard it as a matter of no consequence that the consumers are compelled to pay \$250,000,000 a year for tropical products which these islands will produce, and that the farmers and manufacturers of this country would be deprived, by the loss of these acquisitions, of an annual market of from three hundred to five hundred million dollars.

SCHEMES OF AMBITIOUS STATESMEN.

Perhaps the most unfortunate opposition to expansion comes from the schemes of ambitious statesmen to connect their names with original methods of government unknown to the fathers of the Republic. They seem to assume that the principles of freedom and local self-government which have spread over the vast areas of territory already acquired are not suited to land surrounded by water; that human rights and the principles of government are different on islands from what they are on broad continents, and that while Jeffersonian Territorial governments were good enough for Orleans, Florida, and the great West, it is the duty of a rising statesman to invent some new form of government for the islands never before tried in the history of man. I implore them to consider if it is not possible that the heroic struggles for liberty and self-government which have established on the American continent the freest, the grandest, and the greatest Government of ancient or modern times may not furnish some lessons in the establishment of governments for the islands which it might be useful to study.

Impatience and haste are also obstacles to the accomplishment of the great work of establishing free and stable governments in our island possessions. It was a military problem in the beginning and must remain so until civil governments can be formed. The great virtue of the American system is that civil governments grow out of military enterprises, and God forbid that this order of things should be reversed and military government be established on the ruins of the Constitution. The government of Louisiana in 1803, after the acquisition of that country from France, was a combination of military and executive power while the President of the United States was inaugurating civil government. Florida was acquired in 1819, and it remained a purely military government until 1822, when Congress legislated, establishing civil rule, which had been previously inaugurated by Monroe.

California was acquired in July, 1846, when Commodore Sloat, at Monterey, raised the American flag, and the country remained under military rule without any interference on the part of Congress and very little on the part of the President until the admission of the State in September, 1850. The military officers in that country governed it, inaugurated the present State government without any action by Congress, and finally, when Congress was called upon to act, California had a firmly established State government with a constitution and a system of laws which compare favorably with the constitution and laws of any State in the

Union. On the 9th of September, 1850, Congress accepted what the military officers and people had done and admitted California as a State of the Union.

UNWISE TO LEGISLATE WHILE CONDITIONS ARE UNKNOWN.

It is unwise to legislate for any of these newly acquired islands until it can be ascertained what legislation is necessary and beneficial. The war and the executive power of the Government have been and must continue to be the pioneers in establishing law and order and developing the condition of newly acquired territory before Congress can be possessed of the necessary information for appropriate legislation. Let the arm of the President be strengthened by Congressional authority, as was done in the case of Jackson and Monroe, and let the responsibility of initiating local self-government in the islands remain with the President, where the necessity of the situation requires it to remain. Leave him untrammelled, as other Presidents have been under like circumstances, and let him be responsible for progress in the right direction.

The appointment of a commission to aid in the establishment of local self-government in the Philippines is wise and necessary. Let Congress make it effective by arming the President with legislative sanction, that Aguinaldo and his deluded followers may know that the United States is determined to put down the rebellion and maintain its jurisdiction in every island of the archipelago. Already we hear that guerrilla warfare has been commenced under the belief that the United States is not in earnest, that the President will not be sustained, and that Aguinaldo's dictatorship will ultimately be recognized.

QUESTION ABOVE PARTY.

This is a question above party. It is a question of country. Whatever of hesitation, of selfish or unreasonable opposition may be made to acquiring Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines, there can be but one result. These islands will, with the approbation and consent of the American people, become a most important and valuable part of the United States. When all questions of the acquisition of these islands shall have been settled, peace, order, and local self-government established, the United States will have inexhaustible resources in everything needful and useful which can be found in any part of the world. The people of the United States will then be as proud of their whole country as they are today of any part thereof, and will enter into friendly commercial competition with all the nations of the earth without the slightest apprehension or fear of the triumph of free institutions for the benefit of the human race. The necessities of our people will then be supplied in our own country without depending on foreigners for moral, material, or military support.

The Jeffersonian bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and reported by the committee will give President McKinley the same support in the Philippines as Jefferson and Monroe had in the countries acquired during their Administrations. The bill should become a law with Puerto Rico included and remain in force until the pioneer work in the new acquisitions is done and before any form of government or system of revenue is provided by Congress. The premature contention over details, without a full knowledge of what ought to be done, has already created excitement and unrest in the country prejudicial to the peaceful, speedy, and successful establishment of law, order, and local self-government in our new possessions. If I were permitted to give advice, I would suggest the propriety of amending the Spooner bill so as to include Puerto Rico, pass the appropriation bills and other necessary legislation, and adjourn Congress, and let the people decide whether the policy of expansion inaugurated by the fathers of the Republic shall be continued until the United States is as independent of all other countries for material resources as she is and has ever been independent in her political career.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, line 23, after the word "also," it is proposed to insert "as to railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises."

Mr. FORAKER. Since Senators now have a different print of the bill, I will state that the proposed amendment is in line 3, on page 24, according to the reprint.

Senators may remember the nature of this amendment. Possibly some of them were not in the Chamber when it was under consideration a few days ago; and for the benefit of those, let me say that this is the clause as to the granting of franchises. The provision on that subject, as found in the bill reported by the committee, was that franchises in Puerto Rico should be granted by the executive council, subject to the approval of the governor, and subject also to the approval of the President. That required every franchise, whether it was important or otherwise, to be sent here to be acted upon by the President.

It was thought, after some consideration had been given to the subject, that it would not be necessary to send here for the President to act upon any but the most important ones, such as rail-

road, telegraph, and telephone franchises; and the purpose of this amendment is to make it unnecessary to send here for the action of the President any franchises granted in Puerto Rico excepting only those relating to these three subjects—railroads, telegraphs, and telephones. All other franchises, such as those for electric lighting, gas lighting, or any other kind which may be thought of, will be acted upon and disposed of by the executive council, with the approval of the governor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER].

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I desire to know what will be the effect of passing these amendments in this way, whether the Senate will be thereby concluded; in other words, whether the action of the Senate in making these amendments is a final action?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not. The amendments now being made to the bill are being made in the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, but it will be open to amendment after the bill goes into the Senate; and, then again—

Mr. PETTUS. But not as in Committee of the Whole?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is now before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask is it conclusive on the Committee of the Whole, as the Chair rules?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it is open to all manner of amendments as in Committee of the Whole; to any amendment.

Mr. PETTUS. I have some amendments to propose—that is, amendments which I have had printed and which are now upon the table, in reference to this very matter—and I want to know whether I can have them acted upon when the committee get through with their amendments?

Mr. FORAKER. With the permission of the Chair, if the Senator will allow me, I understand the amendment which the Senator has given notice he will propose is one requiring all these franchises to be acted upon by the legislative assembly.

Mr. PETTUS. And the governor and the President of the United States.

Mr. FORAKER. And the governor and the President of the United States—by all of these officials. I think, therefore, it relates to this same matter, and that our present action would include action also upon the Senator's amendment. I did not speak of his amendment, because I supposed the Senator from Alabama would present his amendment in this connection.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I understand the force of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is to place in charge of the territorial council and the governor all franchises excepting those for railroads, telegraphs, and telephones, which are to be in their charge and in the charge of the President of the United States—that is, as respects the three last named, they will require the approval of the President of the United States before they can become effective. So that the force or the legal effect of the amendment is to deprive Congress of all jurisdiction over the subject of granting franchises in the island of Puerto Rico. Is that correct?

Mr. FORAKER. Well, Mr. President, that is probably the result of it, though that never occurred to me before in connection with the amendment. Of course, all legislation by the legislative assembly is subject to the approval of Congress and may be annulled by Congress when reported, but there is no provision here as to franchises that would be granted by any authority other than the executive council and the President. This provision requires that all these franchises that the President may approve shall be reported to Congress.

Mr. ALLEN. I know; but what has Congress to do after they are reported, if they are first approved by him?

Mr. FORAKER. The Congress, I presume, could do whatever it might see fit to do about the matter.

Mr. ALLEN. Under the terms of this bill, if it shall become a law, a franchise can be granted to a railroad or a telegraph or telephone corporation by the council and governor of Puerto Rico and approved by the President, and that deprives the Congress of all jurisdiction, and there would be no revisory power in Congress whatever, because it amounts to a contract between the Government and the recipient.

Mr. FORAKER. I supposed when we were drafting the bill, and that is the opinion the committee had, that the safeguards provided were sufficient. If the Senator thinks that Congress also ought to be empowered to take action in the matter, I personally have no objection to that kind of a provision being inserted in the bill.

Mr. ALLEN. Section 30 provides:

Provided, however, That all grants or franchises, rights and privileges, or concessions of a public or quasi-public nature shall be made by the executive council, with the approval of the governor, subject also, as to railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises, to the approval of the President of the United States, who shall report the same to Congress.

It leaves it in this condition, that if the council and governor of Puerto Rico and the President of the United States shall approve a charter for a railroad, or a telegraph, or a telephone company, it is conclusive upon the Government irrevocably, and can not be amended or altered or changed in any respect during the life of

the charter; and Congress has nothing to do with the matter, except to receive a mere nominal report from the President of the United States, which he may or may not make. We have no power to require him to make it.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I will say that I have no objection to this provision being amended so as to read as does the conclusion of the preceding section with respect to legislation:

Provided, however, That all laws enacted by the legislative assembly shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority, if deemed advisable, to annul the same.

I have no objection to having those words inserted at the end of the section.

Mr. LINDSAY. Or modify.

Mr. FORAKER. So that it shall read:

Who shall report the same to Congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

If that will answer the objection, let those words be inserted. I think the objection is well taken.

Mr. ALLEN. I suggest this:

Shall report the same to Congress; and said franchises shall not have any legal force or effect until approved and ratified by Congress.

Mr. FORAKER. I would only suggest this difficulty about that phraseology: It might unreasonably delay enterprises and the development of the island. I think if we put it in the form in which the power of Congress to annul is usually reserved, and that is the form that comes at the end of the preceding section—

Mr. ALLEN. I would be perfectly willing to trust the Senator from Ohio to reform it at his leisure, so as to preserve the right of Congress to pass upon these franchises.

Mr. FORAKER. I can insert it now if that language will be satisfactory to the Senator, and I will say to him that I should have inserted it without any suggestion if it had occurred to me.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not pretend to know what the force of that language will be; but I do want to observe—

Mr. FORAKER. I do not hear the Senator from Nebraska, there is so much noise in the Chamber.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not profess to know what the force of the language will be which the Senator proposes to use in the amendment; but I think, all the way through this bill, in every section and in every provision, most ample safeguards ought to be preserved to Congress to revise and control the government of Puerto Rico and its domestic institutions in all respects. There can be nothing clearer than that the government of Puerto Rico must be such as Congress may prescribe.

Congress has the sole power of prescribing a government for the island. It is not within the power of the President of the United States to prescribe a government for Puerto Rico or for any other of these newly acquired islands except as he derives the power to institute a military government incident to military occupation. Now, if that be true, and we being in the transition state from a military to a civil government in Puerto Rico, the greatest caution ought to be observed in the drafting and passage of bills affecting the people and territory of that island in preserving our revisory control.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I will read the amendment which I propose about this matter. It is lying on the table. It is in this section to insert "legislative assembly" instead of "executive council." My purpose in proposing that amendment was the very matter that is being talked about. This section in reference to the action of the legislative assembly provides that Congress may repeal any action of the legislative assembly, and I wanted to have these franchises granted by the legislative assembly and thereby subject them to the revision of Congress. Now, if the Senator will add at the end of that section that all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be subject to revocation or modification by Congress, I do not care anything about this amendment.

Mr. FORAKER. Let me ask the Senator if he would require that as to minor, unimportant ones, or simply as to the important ones?

Mr. PETTUS. Yes, sir; as to all of them. These franchises are more the subject of fraud than any other species of property in the United States. They are more the subject of fraud in the cities than anything else in the cities, and they ought all to be subject to the revision of Congress, and to put that sort of power into a council without having any control is simply to abandon these valuable properties, because they are properties, to those who succeed in having influence over the men in power in that island. They ought to be subject to the revocation and modification of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's amendment will be in order as soon as this amendment is disposed of.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Alabama has stated that if I would make a certain change he would withdraw his amendment. I am perfectly willing to do so. I want to ask the Senator if the language which I propose to offer now will be satisfactory; and I am obliged both to the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Alabama for calling my attention to the matter. It

was the purpose of the committee to guard the granting of franchises, because they appreciate that that is a very important matter, and they would have left it to the legislative assembly except for the fact—I think I ought to say this in justice to the committee—that the legislative assembly can not be in session more than sixty days in any one year. The granting of franchises is something that may come up at any time, and the executive council and the governor will always be there to act upon such applications.

I propose, if the Senator will follow me, so to amend that the clause will read as follows:

Subject also as to railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises to the approval of the President of the United States; and all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to Congress, which hereby reserves the power, if deemed advisable, to annul or modify the same.

Mr. PETTUS. Why "if deemed advisable?" Just say it reserves the power.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not object to that. I took the language out of the other statute. That is how that came in. I will say:

And all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to Congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

I ask that it may be read at the Secretary's desk, so that there may be no mistake about it.

Mr. PETTUS. I have no objection to that, and withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MONEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio who has charge of this bill if it would not be well enough to strike out subject "to the approval of the President of the United States." It is not usual for Territorial legislation that comes here to be revised or approved by Congress to be treated in that way.

Mr. FORAKER. I have no objection to its being stricken out, as we propose now to bring it under the review of Congress.

Mr. MONEY. I think it better, if the Senator will permit that amendment. It is putting the cart before the horse. The President's approval comes after the Houses have acted and not before.

Mr. FORAKER. I presume it would have to be transmitted through some official. The provision as to the President approving came about in the way I have indicated. It was thought impracticable to give the power to the legislative assembly, because it is in session only sixty days in the year, and here were the executive council, and the governor, a part of the council, in session all the time, so that applications might be granted at any moment, or rather might be acted upon at any moment.

Mr. MONEY. Then it will come just as it does in the case of legislation from other Territories.

Mr. FORAKER. I wanted to say to the Senator that my purpose in offering this amendment was to avoid imposing upon the President the necessity to deal with every minor franchise.

Mr. MONEY. I will suggest, if the Senator will accept the amendment, to strike out "to the approval of the President of the United States, who shall report the same to Congress." Let it come through the usual channels.

Mr. FORAKER. Very well.

Mr. MONEY. Of course you can arrange the phraseology so as to make it conform. That is the idea, that it is to be reported in the usual way, as in the case of other Territories.

Mr. FORAKER. Then it will be unnecessary to say anything about railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises, but let the provision read, commencing in the middle of line 2:

With the approval of the governor; and all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to Congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

That is satisfactory to me, if it is to others. Now let the Secretary state it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, line 22, section 30, after the word "governor," it is proposed to strike out the rest of the paragraph and insert:

And all franchises granted in Puerto Rico shall be reported to Congress, which hereby reserves the power to annul or modify the same.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the bill has been reprinted, and that was the last of the amendments that had been brought before the Senate when we were formerly considering the bill, I ask that we may go back to the beginning of the bill as now reprinted and consider amendments as indicated in their order. The first amendment proposed will be found on page 4, and it is to insert, in line 16, after the word "citizens," the following:

Of Puerto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection.

This is the clause that fixes the civil and political status of the inhabitants of the island.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerks at the desk have no copies of the new print.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from

Ohio. We have been over this bill once and put into it the amendments that are called committee amendments. Now the bill seems to be perfected in such form as the committee want it, as I understand.

Mr. FORAKER. Not yet. We went over the bill considering only such amendments as were not contested. Now I am taking up the amendments proposed by the committee about which there will no doubt be more or less debate. I asked consent that the committee amendments might be first considered. That was given, and then I announced that I would first ask the consideration by the Senate of such amendments as I supposed would not be contested, and if when one was offered there was a contest I passed it. Now I am going back to take up those passed over upon objection being made, with a view of having them considered and finally disposed of.

Mr. MORGAN. Many amendments have been presented and many of them have been contested. We have been occupied in this peculiar kind of labor here for about three or four days on this bill, and other Senators who have amendments that they want to offer to the text of the bill it seems will never get an opportunity.

Mr. FORAKER. I have no objection if the Senator wants at any time to offer an amendment. I do not wish to cut him out or cause him to postpone. I will yield at any time when a Senator may wish to offer an amendment or speak upon it.

Mr. MORGAN. If I offer an amendment I want it to be the subject of the action of the Senate.

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. Then I will offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert after section 7 the following:

SEC. —. That any citizen of the United States who shall deposit for coinage, at any mint in the United States, silver bullion of the value of not less than \$100, estimated at the rate of 371½ grains of pure silver per dollar, and at the same time and as a part of the same deposit shall also deposit gold bullion for coinage of equal or greater value, estimated at the rate of 23.22 grains of pure gold per dollar, shall be entitled to have such gold and silver bullion coined in such lawful denominations of gold and silver coins of the United States as he shall designate, and after such deposit none of said bullion shall be withdrawn as bullion from such mint, but such gold and silver bullion shall be coined and the coin shall be delivered to the depositor, his or her assigns or legal representatives, in discharge of the certificate of deposit issued for such deposit.

The superintendent of such mint shall issue to such depositors certificates of deposit, in accordance with this act, and shall refine and coin such bullion of gold and silver for and on account of such depositors in the same manner as if the same was owned by and was coined on account of the Government of the United States, and the charges for refining and coining such bullion shall be the same as are lawfully made in such cases.

No gold or silver bullion shall be deposited for coinage under this act that has been coined or manufactured as an article of commerce, or that is not the product of mines in the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the committee has unanimously reported section 7 of this bill, which contains virtually, if not expressly, a free proposition for the coinage of silver. I will read it:

SEC. 7. That for the purpose of retiring the Puerto Rican coins now in circulation in Puerto Rico and substituting therefor the coins of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to redeem, on presentation in Puerto Rico, all the silver coins of Puerto Rico known as the peso and all other silver and copper Puerto Rican coins now in circulation in Puerto Rico, not including any such coins that may be imported into Puerto Rico after the 1st day of February, 1900, at the present established rate of 60 cents in the coins of the United States for 1 peso of Puerto Rican coin, and for all minor or subsidiary coins the same rate of exchange shall be applied.

The Puerto Rican coins so purchased or redeemed shall be recoined at the expense of the United States, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, into such coins of the United States now authorized by law as he may direct, and from and after three months after the date when this act shall take effect no coins shall be a legal tender, in payment of debts thereafter contracted, for any amount in Puerto Rico, except those of the United States; and whatever sum may be required to carry out the provisions hereof, and to pay all expenses that may be incurred in connection therewith, is hereby appropriated, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to establish such regulations and employ such agencies as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes hereof: *Provided, however*, That all debts owing on the date when this act shall take effect shall be payable in the coins of Puerto Rico now in circulation, or in the coins of the United States at the rate of exchange above named.

We have recently passed what is called the gold bill. It is now the law. My opinion in regard to that bill is that it is entirely radical in its effect upon the coinage system of the United States as well as other parts of our financial system. It is claimed on this side of the Chamber and by those who opposed that bill that the effect of it was to make the legal-tender silver coins of the United States now in existence redeemable at the Treasury of the United States in gold, not by a direct operation dependent upon a direct demand of the holder of the coin, but by the incidental arrangement of converting the silver coin into silver certificates and then taking those certificates to the Treasury and having them redeemed in gold.

I have accepted that law as fixing upon this country that condition. If that is a correct interpretation of the present condition, the silver dollars or other silver coins in use in the United States, amounting to some eight hundred and odd million dollars, are all that will ever be obtained by the people of the United States of that description of coinage so long as that law shall remain in

force. It closes the door forever to the coinage of legal-tender silver dollars.

There is now no possibility, under the law as it exists, of having any silver dollars coined, either by a purchase on account of the Government, or as the personal right of the holder of silver bullion. I was much gratified to find that, in view of that condition of affairs, this honorable committee, a majority of whom are Republicans, have brought forward a measure, in section 7 of this bill, which gives to the holder of the Puerto Rican coins, or Spanish coins in Puerto Rico, the right to go to the Treasury of the United States and have them redeemed, and to have the bullion of which they consist coined; that is, the coinage of silver bullion by the Government of the United States after it has exchanged silver dollars for that bullion on the demand of its owner.

The right that is given by this bill is given to the holders of these Spanish coins whoever he may be. It is not even limited to citizens of the United States. Any holder of a Spanish peso or peseta or any other form of Spanish silver coin will have, under this bill if it becomes a law, the personal right to carry it to the Treasury of the United States and have it exchanged for silver coin at a certain fixed per cent per peso.

That is the free coinage of silver on the demand of the man who holds the Puerto Rican coin, and it is nothing else. There is nothing in the bill which indicates that anything else is the purpose. The committee have come to the conclusion that it is a right that belongs to the holder of the Spanish coins in that island, and of course it must equally belong to the holders of Spanish coins in other islands acquired from Spain, to bring their Spanish money to the Treasury of the United States and exchange it for silver coin, and then to have the bullion coined. It is the free coinage of silver bullion held by Spanish people, or Puerto Ricans, or anybody else on the demand of the holder.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator speaks of bringing Spanish bullion. This bill provides, I understand, only for the coinage of the Puerto Rican peso, which circulates only in the island, and the amount of which is absolutely limited. It does not provide for the coinage of the Spanish peseta. This is special coinage, the Puerto Rican peso, existing only in the island and circulating nowhere else in the Spanish possessions.

Mr. MORGAN. It is none the less silver bullion because it is a Puerto Rican coin. It may have been coined in Puerto Rico, but it is none the less bullion than if it had been coined in Spain. It is bullion and nothing else. It is not money in the view of our statutes. It has no money value here as a coin. Its bullion value is its only value.

Mr. FORAKER. There is this provision in the bill, which possibly the Senator from Alabama overlooked. It authorizes the recoinage of only Puerto Rican coins now in circulation in Puerto Rico.

Mr. MORGAN. Very good. That is, to say, Puerto Rican coins now in circulation, which means simply the silver bullion in circulation as coin. That is all it means. It is not coin according to our statutes. It goes the whole length of opening our mints to the free coinage of Spanish bullion, coined under Spanish law in Puerto Rico, at a fixed price of 60 cents an ounce. The right given for the free coinage of this bullion would be the same in law, if the price fixed was 100 cents per ounce. It is a right given to compel the mints of the United States to coin certain silver bullion, and this is all that the phrase, "the free coinage of silver" means.

It adopts the principle, and I approve it, and I am greatly gratified at it. The same principle was carried in the bill which was reported by a commission of which I had the honor to be a member, for the government of Hawaii. We reported a bill, and when it came to the Senate it was separated from the main measure and sent to the Committee on Finance, and it is pending there now. That provision was to take the bullion as we found it in Hawaii and convert it into coin of the United States. It was the same principle precisely that is found in this bill. It is the whole doctrine of the free coinage of silver on the demand of the holders of bullion, and is not anything else.

Now, inasmuch as we have asserted that right as a correct principle of government in this bill, which I thoroughly approve, I propose to extend it to the people of the United States, not on terms of equal liberality that we extend it to the holders of Puerto Rican pesos or pesetas, but on terms that are somewhat more circumscribed. This step takes us far in the direction of the good we must ultimately reach in our necessary return to the constitutional duty of providing for the coinage of gold and silver on equal terms.

But, before I proceed to define and to explain as well as I can the situation in regard to that particular duty and necessity, I wish to call attention to another state of facts. In these Spanish possessions we have acquired thirteen million of population, or thereabouts, all of whom have transacted almost the entire business of

all the islands, great as it is, upon the basis of silver money. Now, one of two things we ought to do. We ought either to let stand in those islands the Spanish laws that make these coins a legal tender and that provide for their increased coinage, or else we ought to convert them into American coins, as is done in this bill, on the demand of the holder of the Spanish coins, for we can not put those people to a worse disadvantage or inflict upon them greater trouble than to deprive them of the silver coin which they are using in their business and refuse to supply our coins in place of it.

There is nothing that we could do which would give greater distress, bring more serious ruin and disaster upon those people, than to refuse to legalize the silver coins that they have now, and then refuse to supply their places after having stricken them down. No duty the Government of the United States owes to humanity, even to say nothing of its treaty obligations and its obligations under the laws of nations, surpasses in its imperious demand for our consideration this duty of supplying those people with money to carry on their business. It is the vital point. In all their business it is the one indispensable thing. Not only is it cruel, but, Mr. President, it is a reproach to us, that we should undertake to set up a government there and, in doing that duty, destroy the coinage of those people in which their business has been conducted for centuries and provide nothing to supply the place of it.

This bill wisely supplies the place of it, so far as that coinage is concerned. It ought to go further, and it ought to permit coins to be made at the mints of the United States for the purpose of using them in the governmental operations in all these islands, every one of them. We can not take these islands and skim the cream of commerce off of them and supply nothing to them in the way of facilities for conducting that commerce without destroying our own reputation amongst the nations of the earth for ability to govern them wisely. We can not break those people down and leave them a wreck in their financial and commercial condition without providing some substitute for what we are taking away from them.

I do not find any provision here for establishing national banks in Puerto Rico; and I suppose there is none in contemplation for establishing national banks in the Philippine Islands or in Hawaii.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, there is a provision in this bill which extends to Puerto Rico all the laws of the United States of a statutory character, all the enactments of Congress not locally inapplicable, and I presume under that provision a national bank could be established in Puerto Rico.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, if that is a correct assumption on the part of the Senator from Ohio, it shows that we can establish national banks in those islands. That is the proposition?

Mr. FORAKER. That is what we supposed.

Mr. BATE. Then it is not a foreign country.

Mr. MORGAN. Then it is not a foreign country in any sense of the word. It is a country against which you can make no discrimination, because if the national banks are carried into that new country under this bill, every law of the United States is carried in there that can be made useful or be made applicable to any condition that is found in the island of Puerto Rico. There can not be any question whatever about the logic of that proposition.

Therefore I approve, Mr. President, of the exchange of these coins for coins of the United States, with a mandatory provision that they shall be coined. I approve of the proposition that they shall be coined in the mints of the United States on the demand of the owner, and the further proposition that the individual who brings the bullion shall have the benefit of his demand and shall get his pay in the coin of the United States for his bullion at the price agreed upon. That is a good movement. That is in the right direction. That is what has contented me with this bill more than anything else. It was the fact that this movement was made absolutely necessary by conditions that were unavoidable which more than anything else has reconciled me to the expansion of our power and our influence over the newly acquired possessions, and also the further inevitable necessity which the Senate now is looking at with apprehension on the other side of the Chamber, that the tariff laws of the United States shall also be modified to suit these new possessions.

It is the fact that the Republican party, in order to expand the power and influence of this country and carry its flag into the Spanish possessions, find it necessary to come back to Democratic principles for the sake of conducting good government there which causes me to welcome an opportunity that otherwise never would have occurred, perhaps, for a hundred years, to force them to the adoption of Democratic principles and Democratic law as the true law and the true principles of the Government of the United States.

"All things come to him who waits," and, sooner than was hoped for, a protectionist Republican President demands free trade with Puerto Rico and Hawaii, and a gold Republican from

Ohio reports this bill with a free-coinage provision in the seventh section.

Now, sir, I propose to use this principle thus admitted, this wise doctrine of political economy thus confessed, for an additional purpose for the benefit of those people and also for the benefit of ourselves. I want to give to the individual American citizen who owns silver bullion the right to go to the mints of the United States and have it coined exactly as if the bullion he owned were gold bullion. Under the laws of the United States as they exist now, whether gold bullion is in one form or in another, whether it is in the virgin form in which it left the mine, or whether it has even been wrought into articles of commerce, or whether it has been coined into foreign coin, if it is gold bullion, every American citizen and everybody else has the right to carry that bullion to the mint, demand a certificate of deposit for it, have it coined on his own personal account, and take that coin and circulate it through the country and through the world without the consent of any bank or banker or anybody else.

No Democrat has ever complained of that privilege being given to the American people. It has been a boast of the Democratic party always that gold bullion should be coined at the mints of the United States on the personal demand of its holder and that it should be handed out to him as coin after it is converted and stamped in the mint.

That is a principle, Mr. President, which belongs and has always belonged to American citizenship. It belongs to us under the Constitution; for at the time our Constitution was adopted and when we were British colonies and when we threw off the yoke of bondage to Great Britain, it was the law in all of the colonies of Great Britain, by act of Parliament, that every British subject, wherever he might be in all the realm, had the right to go to the British mint and have his gold bullion and his silver bullion coined into money.

That was the law at the time the Constitution was adopted, and it was with reference to that very law that that feature of the Constitution was adopted which forbids the States to permit any other kind of money to be made a legal tender except coins of gold and coins of silver. That had reference to the British statute, which secured a personal privilege—a most valuable personal right—to every British subject. It was retained, secured, and guaranteed in the Constitution and made obligatory on Congress.

Now, what is the personal right of the American citizen, at least as to gold? We have continued that right in our statutes, and under them to-day the right is perfect in any American citizen to have his gold bullion coined at the mints of the United States on his own private account.

The Democratic party, Mr. President, have always insisted that the same right should be extended to silver, and this is "free coinage." That right existed for seventy-odd years—for seventy-three years, I believe—unquestioned in the United States, and those who have denied that right to American citizenship have denied something that was guaranteed to them by the Constitution and by the laws of England at the time we became an independent power, and has always been approved and sustained by the Democratic party. It is the denial of a personal right to an individual that is just as personal to the man himself as the right to the writ of habeas corpus or trial by jury to deny him the right to have the Government convert his bullion into money, whether it is silver or gold. The Government has the sole power to convert bullion into money, and the citizen has the right to demand its exercise. The power can be regulated, but its exercise can not be refused, so as to destroy the value of gold or silver bullion.

Now, we have come to a point where, after having passed this great gold bill and put the country upon what is called a gold basis, we begin to relax in the very first bill that is presented here for consideration after that time; and in that we find the principle reaffirmed, that a man who owns silver bullion in Puerto Rico has the right to bring it to the mints of the United States and have it coined at a certain fixed rate. We are indebted to a Republican Senator from Ohio, Mr. President, for this new departure in search of the old road, I will call it, on the part of that great political organization, and I profoundly thank him for the courage, the manhood, and the recognition of duty that are involved in the report of the seventh section of this bill.

On another occasion, perhaps twenty years ago, we were indebted to another great Ohio Republican, Stanley Matthews, for resolutions which the present Senator from Ohio to-day follows out, giving to the people of the United States the right of the free coinage of gold and silver upon terms of equality, so far as the mint privilege is concerned, and at a ratio fixed by law. From that time until the passage of the gold bill in the Senate a few days ago, the Democratic party, along with some very valuable and very honorable allies who have been associated with us in our efforts, have fought year in and year out, have struggled with all possible power, energy, and determination, to get as much as we could get of silver money coined in the United States, and to enlarge, as far as it was possible to enlarge, the right of the

citizens of the United States to coin silver bullion into money. We have made great progress through great difficulties, many obstructions, some of them coming from Republicans and others coming from Democrats in the Presidential office. We have made great progress.

Finally it has come to this condition, Mr. President, that this country is not only on a gold standard, but that the bond debt is made perpetual, an irredeemable bond debt, redeemable only in name and not in fact. The national banks are the sole dispensers of the power of the Government of the United States in the distribution of money and are given the absolute control of it. But in this bill the first movement is made which I am proud to say I believe will ultimately result in the entire freedom of silver as to its coinage, and it comes again from a Republican Senator from the great State of Ohio, and I welcome the movement.

It may be long delayed through the obstructions of the capitalized classes, but its necessity is confessed in this measure in a bold and, I trust, in a sincere way that can not be hereafter denied. The cements are suddenly broken by this bill, and silver is released from its new-made grave.

The addition which I propose to make to this section I will now read. It is exactly in line with the seventh section. It does not in the slightest degree conflict with it except that it is a narrower provision than the seventh section. It places upon the American citizen some restrictions in regard to the right to have silver bullion coined that are not found in the seventh section of this proposed act.

I will read my proposition:

Any citizen of the United States who shall deposit for coinage, at any mint of the United States, silver bullion of the value of not less than \$100, estimated at the rate of 371½ grains of pure silver per dollar—

Just as here we estimate the peso at 60 cents of the American dollar—

and at the same time and as a part of the same deposit shall also deposit gold bullion for coinage of equal or greater value, estimated at the rate of 23.22 grains of pure gold per dollar—

That is 16 to 1 fixed by law, just as it is fixed by law to-day, the silver dollar which we are now required to redeem in gold, as is asserted, every silver dollar now bears the relation to a gold dollar of 16 grains of silver to 1 of gold—

shall be entitled to have such gold and silver bullion coined in such lawful denominations of gold and silver coins of the United States as he shall designate, and after such deposit none of said bullion shall be withdrawn as bullion from such mint—

That is to prevent a fraudulent deposit and to force the coinage when you make the deposit, without the liberty of withdrawing it—but such gold and silver bullion shall be coined and the coin shall be delivered to the depositor, his or her assigns, or legal representatives, in discharge of the certificate of deposit issued for such deposit.

The superintendent of such mint shall issue to such depositors certificates of deposit, in accordance with this act, and shall refine and coin such bullion of gold and silver for and on account of such depositors in the same manner as if the same was owned by and was coined on account of the Government of the United States, and the charges for refining and coining such bullion shall be the same as are lawfully made in such cases.

No gold or silver bullion shall be deposited for coinage under this act that has been coined or manufactured as an article of commerce, or that is not the product of mines in the United States.

There is another limitation, a very much more stringent limitation than the one that is imposed by the seventh section of this bill upon the Puerto Rican coin. They are bullion. What I offer to have coined under this additional section is bullion. They are bullion that has been coined in the Puerto Rican mints. What I offer is the virgin silver and the virgin gold that come from the American mine and belong to American citizens and must be deposited in one deposit and in equal quantities, or at least that there shall be as much gold deposited as there is of silver in value, and when coined the coin shall be delivered into the hands of the depositor.

Now, Mr. President, where is the injustice of that? Who can suggest that there is some inequality in this proposition, that there is some advantage given in favor of silver over gold or of gold over silver? They are to be deposited in equal amounts, deposited together, coined at the same mint and under the same deposit, and the money is to be handed out when coined into the hands of the depositor. Where can be the injustice; where can be the danger to the national banks, or the capitalists of the country, or the holders of gold mines, or to any other person when every time we coin a silver dollar we must also coin a gold dollar and put it in circulation?

The silver money of this country, after it has been dethroned from its constitutional attitude of a money metal, is made to play the part of a transgressor against the law; something that has committed some public sin against the general welfare, something that is unworthy of a place in the American coinage, except in virtue of the provision that it is made redeemable in gold coin. It is the theory of the gold bill, it is the theory of the Republican party at this time, that there stands behind every silver dollar in the United States a pledge of gold redemption. That is the theory, although it is infinitely far from the fact. Now, if under this section that I propose to add to the bill you issue a gold dollar at

every time you issue a silver dollar, you produce the redeemer at the same time that you create the sinner.

The alleged silver token is always attended with its redeemer and can not be coined in its absence. The antidote goes along with the alleged poison, and the redemption takes place instantly; they both pass out into the country, the one to stand for redemption and the other to be redeemed, just like it is on the presentation of a silver dollar or of a gold five-dollar piece at the Treasury Department and the taking out of a gold certificate or a silver certificate. That remains in circulation among the people for the purpose of redeeming the silver dollar that was put out at the same time, and the parity is made perfect.

Now, what effect will this have upon the country? The first effect will be to stimulate the production of gold in the mines of the United States. Is there any reason why the production of silver metal should not be encouraged in the United States from mines within our own limits when we know perfectly well that silver is not a useless and worthless thing; when we know that the nations of the earth are bound to have it, at least for subsidiary coinage; when we know that the Almighty gave us these facilities here for the purpose of enabling the people to carry on their work, and without which it can not be carried on? We can not treat or consider the possession of silver mines as being a matter of no value to the people and no source of wealth for them. On the contrary, it is our duty to make for ourselves, our people, and our Government all the advantage that we can out of the ownership of these silver mines.

The most irrational and fatuous neglect and abuse of a vast and peculiar source of wealth to our people—our silver mines—is locked up by the hand of avarice, and the key is handed over by our politicians to the money kings of Europe. I fear it will remain so until some terrible war has forced us to look to our silver resources to supply the place of European credit and capital, from which we shall then be divorced. We can prevent such a war if we will now begin to coin these treasures.

Senators know perfectly well that it is only in the Western Hemisphere that silver is produced in any appreciable quantities. The Western Hemisphere is the silver-bearing part of this world. The Eastern Hemisphere has gold in great quantities, but very little silver is there to be found—a little in Germany, a little in Russia; and where else will you go in the Eastern Hemisphere to find silver? A very small fraction is produced in China, possibly a little in Japan, but the great silver-bearing region of this world is the Western Hemisphere, commencing with the mountains of Alaska, extending to Patagonia, through the whole sweep of this great range of mountains.

As the world is obliged to have silver, and as nations and cities and dense communities could not subsist without the use of silver subsidiary coin, why should we not, being the possessors of the most valuable silver mines in the world, create a policy here which will stimulate the production of silver and also of gold? Europe and Asia must furnish us with a market for silver that can never fail. Have we got to the point where we are afraid of an inundation of specie money? Are we afraid that the time has come or is about to come or that it will ever come when there will be too much specie money in this country?

Well, Mr. President, I can say for a vast mass of the people of the United States who are called Democrats that there is not one of them who ever shivered at that prospect, not one. The Democrats of the United States would gladly welcome an extension of the specie basis of this country, and at the proper time—which, I think, is any time—a motion will be made to compel the national banks of this country to substitute in place of the national bonds as a basis of their banking circulation this specie basis of gold and silver. We shall have to come to that pretty soon.

Ultimately we will be bound to come to it; we can not avoid it. This country can not go along on the plan of issuing bonds and continuing to issue bonds, to be charged as interest upon the labor and industry of the country, in order to furnish a foundation for a national-bank system. We have got to get some other foundation for it. The laboring men of this country are not going to consent to be taxed, they and their children, for ages and ages to come, to sustain the national banks and the classes of society to which they pander and which they assist in building up into exclusive and masterful communities in this land.

The Democratic idea, Mr. President, will prevail upon this question. It is bound to work out. It may be said that the silver question is dead. Suppose it was dead, Mr. President—dead as Hector. We have found the Republican Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] bringing it up in the seventh section of this bill and opening it again. He is obliged to bring up the silver question and put it into the bill in order to keep those poor Puerto Rican people from starving to death, and that is exactly what we have got to do in the United States to keep a great many other people from starving to death after a little time.

This is what is destroying India to-day. Seventy million people in India to-day are in starvation. The Senate of the United

States, it seems, can look at that with perfect complacency. We, perhaps, need not disturb our slumbers or our dreams in our own splendid condition of present enjoyment by reflecting that there are 70,000,000 people in India to-day who are starving. It is very hard to get our people to believe it, and yet that is the fact. The British Government is straining every possible energy and using all of its vast resources for the purpose of trying to prevent the starvation, which they themselves have caused.

Mr. President, it is not the withholding of the rain, or the refusal of the hand of labor, or the presence of disease or of war—for there is no war in India—that has caused this starvation there. What has caused it? The British gold policy. How has it caused it? By taking off the supply of money from the poor people, who live on small amounts of money daily. It has reduced the supply of money in India, and food can not be obtained, not so much because of the failure of the crops as because you can not get interchange of produce from one part of that country with another, even where they have railroads and canals, but where the money is not in the hands of the people to buy provisions. When the British Government carries the provisions to them, they must do it as a bounty, the people themselves not being able, for want of a sufficient circulating medium in that country, to buy anything.

That is the condition of India. Senators may make light of it, but they can not find any other reason for it. That is a plain and palpable fact, and it will come in this country when our populations get congested to two or three times the number of people we have got here unless we accept the invitation of the Almighty and open our mines of gold and silver and allow the people to use gold and silver as coin in the conduct of their business, as they have the constitutional right to do.

The first impression that will be produced by the passage of this bill is that it will stimulate the silver mines in this country to production. That ought to be done. They ought not to go to waste. The silver ought not to be allowed to remain locked up in the bowels of the earth. Silver ought to be doing its duty among the business men of this country, rich and poor, but particularly and chiefly amongst the poorer classes of the people. There will be an addition to the value of money in this country. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. President, when we think of the enormous additions of population to our country even through immigration, to say nothing of the natural increase from year to year, we find that it is necessary to increase the volume of money to correspond with it. Can any Senator here name a country in this world, except Argentina, that is receiving an acquisition of population by immigration besides the United States? If so, what country is it that in its daily reports of its population shows that it is receiving an increase of popular strength from the other parts of the world?

To what country is it that the American emigrates? What line of migration has ever started in any part of the United States to draw our people away from this country, to carry them to some more favored land? Nothing of that sort has ever occurred.

Mr. President, so long as our institutions are what they are and so long as we carry into effect that grand, splendid pledge of individual liberty found in the Constitution of the United States, this emigration will never take place. It may follow expansion into distant places, under the flag of the country, but there is no man who has ever tasted of American liberty who is willing to exchange it for the liberties of any other country in the world.

No man who has ever shared the honors of its flag is willing to exchange them for the honors of any other flag that floats on sea or land. So that there is no disposition on the part of Americans to emigrate. But this country is filling up annually with from six hundred thousand to a million of new acquisitions of population from other countries. That is keeping on and on. Every man who comes here requires that much more of currency created by law in this country in order to transact his business. If we had as many people in the United States to-day as there are in China, which has not much over two-thirds of the area of territory that we possess, the amount of money that we have here of all kinds and descriptions, gold, silver, paper money, national-bank notes, and Treasury certificates, would not be one-third of what would be requisite for carrying on the business of the country, and paralysis would take place in all classes of industry almost instantaneously.

As the country expands and as it grows without expansion it is the duty of the Government of the United States to increase the volume of sound money, just such sound money as is provided for in the seventh section of this bill. I can not assume in justice to the honorable Senator from Ohio that in the seventh section of this bill he proposes to pay to the Puerto Ricans any unsound money for the Spanish pesos and pesetas. He takes a Spanish peso and he prices it at 60 cents, and pays for it with silver coin. You are not giving that man unsound money; you are not tricking him out of his little earnings and sending to him silver money which is unsound. That would not do; that would be immoral; that would be, Mr. President, scarcely less than petit larceny by an act of Congress.

So it is sound money that we are giving to those people, and it is sound money that I propose to issue dollar for dollar, gold and silver in company, so that no silver dollar shall issue without its accompanying dollar of gold. That is sound money, and if gold is the redeemer, it needs no other atonement. It is that much sounder than the silver would be by itself if the Republican doctrine is true. I accept the situation for the sake of the argument, not because it is true. Out goes the silver dollar, attended by its escort and redeemer, the gold dollar; one can not go without the other. In doing that we are filling up the substratum, the real foundation, the basis of currency in this country, to meet the many exigencies that are arising, exigencies created by immigration to this country, exigencies created by the expansion of our territorial domain; exigencies created, Mr. President, by the command of the Almighty that we shall make good use of all the materials we have in our possession that He has bestowed upon us. We can not ignore that duty without doing ourselves a serious and an unchristian wrong.

I have now, I think, explained this matter so far as it is necessary to go with it at the present time. If anyone else wishes to discuss this subject, I shall be very glad to hear some objections that can be urged against this measure; I shall be very glad to have pointed out to me some disadvantage it can possibly be to the people of the United States or the people of Puerto Rico.

My purpose in bringing the question forward, Mr. President, is not the mere idea of a party man trying to gain a political advantage. I present this subject at the first opportune moment, which has been furnished in the seventh section of this bill, and upon exactly the parallel principles that are found in the seventh section, for the purpose of inviting the attention of the Senate of the United States and the Congress and the people of the United States to the fact that we still have open to us under the gold law an opportunity to enlarge the specie basis of this country, to improve the value of our mines, and, Mr. President, above all, to hold them in the control of the Government of the United States.

If we pass this proposition that I present now to the Senate of the United States, it will not be one year until every dollar that can be taken out of the silver mines of the United States will be coined as it is taken out. Men will easily find the gold bullion to carry in company with their silver in order to get the right of joint deposit and to get the money that will result therefrom. This will cause the mints to increase their output of money with great rapidity, and it will bring into the coinage every dollar of silver that we can produce from our mines. Is that going to flood the country with iniquity and wrong and disaster and crime?

Has it ever been heard of, or will it ever be heard of, that it is an unjust thing or a dangerous thing to open the mines of this country and send out the silver and gold in equal quantities? Mr. President, that would destroy this competition between gold and silver, which means the competition between the capitalist and the ordinary toiler in the fields. Neither of them would have any advantage; but the toiler would have the right to produce, if he were a miner, at the point of his pick, when the sun went down upon his daily labor, the bullion which he can mint into money and circulate in the payment of his debts and the purchase of what he wants, without asking the consent of any banker that lives; and until we get into that condition we will not realize, as we did for seventy-three years in this Government, the true, real, actual, individual liberties of the citizen.

It is a part of my liberty, sir, that I have the right to have gold coin. That is secured to me by law. Why is it secured to me by law that I can take gold bullion and go to the mint in Philadelphia or to the Treasury here in Washington and demand its coinage, instead of keeping it in bullion in my pocket? Because that is secured to me by the Constitution of my country and by the law of my country. Why can I not take silver, if I hold that in bullion, and have that coined? It was a right that existed under the Constitution and under the laws of the United States and under the laws of England for two centuries before the Constitution of the United States was adopted.

I had that right, which a political party, for the purpose of setting up the national banks in supreme control of the financial affairs of this country, have taken away from me. That is all of it. I am a man robbed of his rights as an American citizen by an act that I consider, Mr. President, unconstitutional and excessively cruel and very unjust to the whole country; and I think it is a shameful defiance of the laws of God—that is my view about the silver question—a shameful defiance of the laws of God.

Now, sir, when I offer to do this, when I present the proposition to the Senator from Ohio, following the principles of the proposition he himself has offered in this bill, not departing from them one iota, it can not be said of me that I am attempting to work some political purpose; it can not be said of me that I am bringing up a subject of irritation for the purpose of delaying the Puerto Rican government, which I am very anxious should be established by this bill.

I do it, Mr. President, for the purpose of addressing myself to this question at a moment and under circumstances where I have

the precedent and the rule laid down in section 7 of this bill. I follow it strictly, closely, and do not depart from it; and I insist that I have the right, under the logic of the seventh section, to extend this free-coinage privilege that is given to the Puerto Rican citizen, so as to recover back my right to have silver coined if I can produce gold to accompany it, and to let the two metals accompany each other.

The voting down of this amendment, Mr. President, will be the final declaration on the part of the Senate of the United States that no more silver dollars in this country shall ever be coined so long as the Republican party has the power to prevent it. Now, I am willing to meet them on that issue, politically speaking. If they have the judgment which I suppose they are possessed of, they will hesitate a long time before they raise a question of that kind in the campaign to be determined in November next; for when the people of the United States see that this gold law means that there is to be no more silver coined forever so long as the Republican party is in power, they will make way for putting that party out of power very suddenly.

There is nothing demanded here that is not right, that is not constitutional, that is not just and equitable, that is not safe. If any Senator wants to discuss this question after I take my seat, I hope he will address himself to any possible danger that might arise out of the adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I only want to say before a vote is taken that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama is in the nature of general legislation, while the legislation under consideration has reference only to Puerto Rico and to affairs and questions concerning Puerto Rico.

The provision the Senator finds in section 7 is not a provision, as I understood him to characterize it, providing for the free coinage of silver bullion, but it is a provision for the exchange and redemption of Puerto Rican coins in the manner provided in that section, in order that the people of Puerto Rico may have for the transaction of their business only one kind of coin, and that American coin. The whole purpose of the provision is to meet a necessity which is existing in that island, and which, according to present conditions, is working very great hardship in the way of a handicap, as it were, upon all kinds of business transactions.

It does not seem to be necessary, Mr. President, to answer the Senator further than to simply make this general statement. I think the statement of the Senator that the provision is in the nature of a provision for free coinage generally is entirely unwarranted and that his amendment is out of harmony with this bill. We are not in favor of the free coinage of silver, even when tendered with such compliments as the Senator saw fit to bestow upon the author of the section in question.

It is always a delight, Mr. President, to hear the Senator from Alabama. He is so able and so fertile; he is so kind; he is so agreeable that I hope the day is far distant when he will not belong in this Chamber. He is a delight to every member of this body, and he enjoys the unqualified respect and esteem of all who are in political opposition to him. That is well known to all here, but that is not enough to induce us to accept this amendment.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senator will understand that we are not showing any lack of appreciation for the proposition he has made in dismissing the matter without discussing it at length and in the serious way in which he has presented it to the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, this proposition can not be passed over and will not be passed over by the people of the United States in any light way.

The Senator makes a distinction, or attempts to do so, between the redemption of a peseta or peso of the Puerto Rican coinage and the coinage of American bullion. Suppose I should change the phraseology of my amendment, and say that when \$100 of gold and \$100 of silver, the product of an American mine, is presented at a mint, it shall be redeemed in the coin of the United States, of gold or silver, at the rate of 371½ grains of pure silver or 23.25 grains of pure gold, would there be any difference between the two propositions? There would be only a difference in words.

When I have the right to deposit gold and silver at the mints and demand for it the coinage of the United States to be handed back to me, whether that coinage shall consist of the same metal or some other metal, it makes no difference—that is the redemption, if you please to call it such, of the bullion in the coin; it is a conversion, to use the proper term; and while the Senator has used the word "redemption" here, it is only a conversion; it is a change of the Spanish peseta into the American dollar or the Spanish peso into the American dollar or other American coin; for the bill provides that when this coin is deposited by the holder in his own right in a mint of the United States it shall be coined into the silver money of the United States. It is redeemed; it is converted; it is changed; it is coined.

The idea and the principle is precisely the same, and there is no refinement of language or argumentation that can get away from the main fact that we give to the Puerto Ricans here the right to come or to anybody who owns those pesetas or pesos the right to come to the mint, to deposit them, and have them coined, and to receive for them the silver coins of the United States. That is all I claim for the people of the United States.

The Senator spoke as if the people of Puerto Rico were not to be citizens of the United States; that it was a favor given to some foreign people, some people in some peculiar situation. Well, that only makes the argument stronger in my favor, for we ought to do for our own citizens what we are not compelled to do for citizens of other countries, if the argument is that they are not citizens. But they are citizens. The treaty of Paris makes them citizens. It puts it in the power of the Government of the United States to use them in its armies, to do anything else with them, to force their obedience to our laws, and they are subject to our power. If in that light they are not citizens of the United States, then we have no citizens. I do not know what their powers may be as provided by act of Congress, and I have not looked at that subject as it is presented in this bill; but I do claim that they are citizens of the United States in respect to this particular function and power which is given to them in the seventh section of this bill.

No, sir; this matter can not pass off lightly; it can not pass off without notice; it is a serious proposition; it is not out of order; it is no departure from the principle or the plan of the bill; it is directly in line with it; it is the subject of legitimate legislation, just as much so as when the seventh section gives the right of coinage or the right of redemption or the right of exchange in favor of the owner of Spanish money—just the same.

It may be, Mr. President, that the country have not caught upon the idea, it may be that they have not yet appreciated the situation in regard to the gold law. That is very true. Our people are as dead as if they were frozen in an Alaskan glacier on the subject of gold and silver at this moment; but as soon as the people have discovered the work that has been done against them you will see, Mr. President, that the reaction will be volcanic. The people will rise in their majesty, and they will throw off the men and the powers that have enchained them in that gold law. I am furnishing the Senators now an opportunity to pacify the people; an opportunity to do them justice; an opportunity to show that the Republican party of the United States are not for ever and ever compelled by their present commitments against the restoration of silver money to the people of this country.

Is silver dead absolutely? Is the silver dollar gone out of the coinage, gone out of existence, except something that remains to be redeemed? Has it now become so thoroughly demonetized that it requires the action of the Congress of the United States to bring it back to life? That seems to be the situation. It has been destroyed. There is no doubt about that, Mr. President. Silver money is in nothing like so favorable a condition to-day as it was when the John Sherman Act of 1873 was passed. The act of this Congress in passing the gold bill has placed silver money in a far worse condition than it was placed in 1873; and yet the people seem to be sadly looking on. They are dazed. They have not yet comprehended what has happened to them.

Some of us understand it and have been trying to inform them as to the great outrage which has been perpetrated upon them in that bill; and now when I come forward with a measure which will give the people very great relief, they say that because they like me they do not wish to treat the subject very harshly; they do not wish to debate it because they are pleased with me and my presence in this Chamber. I warn Senators that they must not think the crow will drop the grapes from his mouth because the fox at the foot of the tree is trying to beguile him.

This movement which is going on here before the Senate, where 90 per cent of the seats are vacant, when the Senators are off amusing themselves or attending to other matters of business, will strike to the very bottom of the political situation of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Alabama to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORGAN. I did not. The people of the United States will call this debate in question. They will examine into what is being said. They will examine into the merits of this amendment. They will hold the Republican party of this country responsible for what the Senator from Ohio has said here this evening—that the subject is hardly worthy of consideration.

Mr. FORAKER. Oh, Mr. President, I did not say the subject was not worthy of consideration. The Senator entirely misunderstood my remarks if he thought I said any such thing. I think it is a very important subject; but I said the amendment of the Senator is in the nature of general legislation, and therefore we did not feel disposed to take it into serious consideration in connection with this bill, which is special, simply providing a civil government for Puerto Rico and dealing only with Puerto Rican affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. Suppose it is in the nature of general legislation. Where is legislation more general than that found in this bill? It is the first effort we are making to control these Spanish possessions. There is wrapped up in the provisions of this bill more general legislation than I ever saw in one bill. There are more general provisions, each one extremely important, found in the body of this bill than in any other bill which has been reported to the Senate since I have been in the body. It is a new movement on the part of the United States. It includes every interest of everybody, not only in the Spanish islands but in the entire country. It includes the most profound discussions and considerations of the Constitution of the United States in all of its bearings and in regard to all of its departments, legislative, executive, and judicial.

This is, sir, a general bill, as much a general bill as any that was ever offered at that desk; and general legislation, providing for the people of the United States, is as much at home upon this bill as it would have been upon the gold bill. It is not only at home, but it is here by invitation, for the gentlemen, finding that they could not get along without providing silver money for Puerto Rico, have come back to the general proposition that it is their duty to do it, and they are proposing to supply that money by what they call an act of exchange or redemption of Puerto Rican money into American coin.

What obligations are we under to redeem Puerto Rican money? Put it upon that ground—that this money shall be redeemed at the Treasury. Are we under an obligation to those people that their money shall be as good as gold? If we have come under any obligations at all, that is the effect—that their money, which was as good as gold in Puerto Rico and circulated freely as legal tender, shall be as good as gold in the United States. But instead of complying with that obligation, we price it at 60 cents on the dollar, put our own price on it, and compel them to do it or else banish it from the island. That is the legislation we are indulging in here, legislation of the most general character.

A man anywhere who owns one of these pieces of money can go and demand its redemption at 60 cents on the dollar at any mint in the United States. A citizen of the United States or of Spain (whether he resides in one of these States or Territories or in Puerto Rico makes no difference under this bill) has the general, universal right to go and demand redemption. Is not that general legislation? Is not that legislation that affects everybody in the United States?

How can the Senator content himself with answering the argument that has been made here this afternoon, and others very much stronger that could be made by abler men, by saying that this appears to be a departure; that this is specific legislation for Puerto Rico and not general legislation. Sir, we are always engaged in general legislation when we are dealing with the principles of this Government, and especially those that are based upon the Constitution of the United States. We can not escape it. Senators need not suppose that there is any possibility of escaping the full measure of responsibility to the people of the United States for the rejection of this amendment. It is an important subject. It is a proper subject.

The view I present in this amendment is a just view. If it is unjust toward any person in the world, it is toward those who own silver bullion, the product of American mines. I repeat that we have limited the right to the citizens of the United States and to bullion produced in American mines that has never been mined or wrought into articles of commerce, and we have priced it upon exactly the basis that obtains to-day between gold and silver coins in this country; that is to say, the basis of 16 to 1. That obtains here now. Nobody has ever attempted to change it until we come to this bill, when the basis is changed to a different rate and 30 per cent is knocked off the value of a silver peso, nine-tenths fine, standard silver. Thirty per cent is knocked off in order to give those people down there the money.

How much money are we going to make out of this and at what rate are you going to coin this bullion when you get it into the Treasury of the United States? Four hundred and twelve and a half grains make a dollar, and we buy that much money from these Puerto Ricans, by compulsion, at 60 cents. That is what this bill provides for. We compel them to go without money or take it at 60 cents on the dollar.

What kind of justice is that to them, if you please? Why not say to them, "You shall bring your money into the Treasury of the United States, to the mints of the United States, and have it coined in any of the mints at the rate of 16 grains of pure gold for 371½ grains of pure silver?" Why not say that to them? Why do we not place their silver money upon exactly the same basis that other silver money occupies in this country to-day? For it can not be denied that a legal-tender silver dollar, if there is any such existing in the United States now, does contain 412½ grains of silver, nine-tenths fine. That can not be disputed.

When we are dealing with this subject we ought not to act arbitrarily. We ought to deal with it on principles of exact jus-

tice. The Government of the United States will make money, large money, out of the seventh section of the bill and out of the poor Puerto Ricans. It is bound to do it, for a peso containing as much silver as there is in an American dollar is brought here under the compulsion of this law and "redeemed" at 60 cents.

There is a margin of 30 cents on the dollar that we are making as a Government for giving them the privilege of using our coin; exchanging it, as they call it; redemption, they call it, when we are under no obligation to redeem; when there is no promise outstanding for redemption. There is no redemption about it, because there is no promise to be redeemed. There is no obligation to be lifted. Under this specious and improper word "redemption" we are forcing these people to deliver up their coins at the mints of the United States in exchange for American coin at 60 cents on the dollar. We call it redemption.

No, sir; it is free coinage. It gives them the privilege of doing it or not doing it. They can take this money and go to Spain with it, where it is at par, and use it there. The result of the bill that we are passing now, in its seventh section, unattended with the section I propose, will be to drive the Spanish money out of Puerto Rico and leave those people poorer and worse off than they could possibly be in any other way.

The bill provides that after its passage nothing shall circulate there as legal tender except the money of the United States. What then becomes of all these pesos and pesetas, all the silver money in Puerto Rico, and what will become of it in the other islands, where about 13,000,000 people are in daily use of it? It will all be swept out and carried back to Spain. These islands will be denuded of silver currency until we can supply the place of it, and our laws do not provide any means of supplying the place of it except under a measure like that which passed here yesterday for the purchase of silver bullion to be coined into subsidiary coin of the United States.

There is no power in the United States to-day to coin a legal-tender silver dollar. There is no possibility of it, and a legal-tender silver dollar could not go into Cuba or Puerto Rico or the Philippine Islands or any of the late Spanish possessions unless we take it there through our Governmental agencies and pay it to the people out of the money already coined into silver dollars. The fate of the silver dollars was sealed by the gold bill. No other silver dollars ever will be or can be coined while that bill is the law of the United States. Here comes the island of Puerto Rico, with a million inhabitants, knocking at the doors of the consciences of the Senate, finding a ready response in the heart of the honorable Senator from Ohio, who proposes to them "if you will take 60 cents on the dollar for your peseta that is worth a hundred cents we will let you have American coin for it."

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me, does he not know that this peso in Puerto Rico is now worth in our money really only about 45 or 48 cents?

Mr. MORGAN. I think so.

Mr. FORAKER. And that we are proposing to give them 60 cents, as the Senator said a while ago, in gold, I believe, or the equivalent of gold at any rate.

Mr. MORGAN. This is a very munificent thing. We are rich and can afford to do that. Why not give them a dollar?

Mr. FORAKER. What I wanted to call to the attention of the Senator is the fact that we are not seeking to deprive them of any value, but we are paying them far in excess of the real value, which is all they can realize there.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Ohio allow me to ask him a question right here?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask if it is not true that the peso of which he speaks contains an ounce of silver, and if we take it and redeem it in silver or gold, American money, and coin it, will we not really coin it into a dollar and will we not get a dollar for it? It contains the same amount of silver, I understand, that our silver dollars contain.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know into what it will be coined, but I know it is worth only what I have indicated. We are proposing to pay them more for it than it is worth. If it be only bullion, as the Senator from Alabama stated, they are selling it at a good price, one advantageous to them. We are not compelling them to turn in their coins and to have them redeemed and to take other coins in exchange.

We are simply giving them that opportunity, in order that there may be only one kind of money in Puerto Rico. If they prefer to take their money to Spain or to send it there, where the Senator says it will have greater value, that is their privilege. They are not denied that. The Puerto Ricans, so far as I am aware, are not making any complaint, but they are very greatly pleased with the proposition. We are under no obligation to make their Puerto Rican coins legal tender there or elsewhere. We take the situation as we find it.

Mr. CLAY. Is it not true that we get from them the same amount of silver that we put into our silver dollars? If that is so,

will we not really get a dollar's worth of silver from them and pay them 60 cents for it, and recoin it, and place it in circulation for a dollar?

Mr. FORAKER. It is true that we are paying them 60 cents for what we might buy elsewhere for less money. We can do with it as we like after we get it, I presume. The United States is not buying it with the idea of coining it into money and increasing the silver coinage of the country or of making any profit. If we were, we could buy all the silver we could coin for years to come for a much less price, as I understand it.

Mr. MORGAN. I called attention in the opening of my remarks on this subject to the fact that the seventh section of the bill requires this money to be coined into coins of the United States; whether it is dollars or half dollars or quarter dollars makes no difference. It is coin of the United States at the rate of 412½ grains of silver nine-tenths fine. The ounce of silver that is contained in a peso, as the Senator from Georgia very properly suggests, is worth a dollar in our coinage.

We go to the people whom we have brought within the influence of our sovereign power, who are entirely helpless, and we find them in possession of a coinage of silver without which they can not live, the only money in Puerto Rico they ever used in their business at all, and we say to them: "You are citizens of the United States; you are liable to serve in our armies; we can tax you; this bill taxes you; this bill imposes a government upon you that is very expensive, and all that; you have money here that rates at only 45 cents on the dollar, and we propose to raise it from 45 up to 60;" and the Senator from Ohio says that is a great benefit to the people of Puerto Rico, and that the people down there are greatly pleased with it. Suppose we found a Territory in the American Union here within the body of our old organization that was in the same condition.

Would we ever think of taking up the money of the people of that territory at 60 cents on the dollar, as they have always used it, and paying them for it in coins of the United States at that rate? We do make 30 cents on every dollar, for the reason that the bill requires that the money shall be coined, and when we coin it the Spanish peso produces in value in gold 100 cents, and we pay for it 60 cents to the poor, miserable Puerto Ricans. That is what this bill does.

I did not intend to object to the bill on that account if I could get the privilege in favor of American citizens of doing what the Puerto Rican can do, come here and have his bullion coined. We say to the Puerto Rican, "You can bring it here to the mint and you shall have it coined. We will price it at 60 cents on the dollar." I say in the amendment to the American silver miner and the man who owns bullion in this country, "Bring your silver here; bring along with it its redeemer, gold; put them both to work at the same time, so that one shall have no advantage over the other, so that there shall be no inundation of either kind of metal, and we will give you the right to have your silver coined along with the gold. We will restore to you that personal privilege, and put it into your hands, so that you can go to the mint with your silver bullion, just as you can now go with the gold bullion, and demand the coinage of it as a right." That is what I want. That is the free coinage of silver.

People usually do not properly estimate the meaning of that phrase—"free coinage of silver." It does not mean that silver shall be coined without some payment for the manufacture of it from bullion into coin. It does not mean that you must go and melt up the spoons and dishes in the country to make silver money of them, though sometimes that would be very useful, especially in time of war. I have seen times, Mr. President [Mr. ALLEN in the chair], and you have, when that expedient would have been very valuable to both sides whom we were representing at that time. It does not mean that. The free coinage of silver means the right of the individual man who owns the bullion to take it to the mint, as he does when he owns gold, and demand the coinage of it.

It is the right of the free man to do with his property what the Constitution of the United States provided and what God intended when he made it. That is all. That is the free coinage of silver. The law fixes the rate. It fixes the rate between every silver dollar existing in the United States and every gold dollar—16 to 1. In this bill it is fixed at 60 cents on the dollar, which is a wrong and injustice to the Puerto Ricans, and it is one that we can not remedy in any other way so as to give those people silver money, except by giving them this privilege when they are American citizens, to bring the silver or allow somebody else to do it and have it coined without getting the consent of a certain class of people in the United States.

Mr. President, we are not on an equality with each other about these things. There is a certain very valuable class of property in the United States that the Almighty has never condemned, the experience of mankind has never condemned, a class of money that to-day your Government lives upon, for if you could take these silver dollars that exist in the United States to-day and melt them back into bullion your Government would go to ruin in twenty-four hours. It would go into bankruptcy. Your banks

would fail. Your business would stop. All the operations of commerce would cease. If we were to strike out of existence as coin and return it into existence as bullion the 800,000,000 silver dollars that we have coined since 1877 this Government would go to bankruptcy in twenty-four hours.

This Government is now living upon the silver that we have coined in this country through many trials and labors and tribulations in the last thirty years. That silver has a legal relation to gold at 16 to 1, and it will stay there. But there will not be a dollar added to it. It makes no difference what the growth of the country may be, what its necessities may be in time of famine or war or pestilence, the inexorable law of the gold bill that we passed here the other day forbids the coinage of another dollar of silver.

My heart, sir, leaped with joy when I found the honorable Senator from Ohio, a Republican, coming into this Chamber with a free-coinage proposition for silver. I propose to avail myself of it. I propose to improve upon it as I did once before, twenty-three years ago, when the honorable Stanley Matthews brought forward his celebrated resolutions. Upon that foundation all the work we have done since has been built.

I am glad that the Senator from Ohio has been forced by circumstances which were irresistible and which he tries now to smile away as if he were under no compulsion and under no pressure—I rejoice, sir, that the conditions of this country have forced him to bring this question to the front and have compelled him to put a free-coinage section in his bill. This is not to be laughed down. It is not to be passed by at an idle moment as an amusing episode in legislation. What is being said here now, not by me, but in the language of this amendment and this bill, will reach down to the hearts and consciences of the American people, and they will enact it at the expense of the Republican party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CHILTON].

Mr. MCBRIDE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McMILLAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY]. He not being present, I withhold my vote. I should vote "nay" if he were present.

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PETTUS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], who is absent on account of family affliction. I therefore withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (after having voted in the negative). Inadvertently I voted in the absence of the Senator with whom I am paired, and I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that we exchange pairs, which will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. PETTUS. Very well, sir.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. PETTUS. I vote "yea."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. QUARLES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. If he were here, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SULLIVAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. He not being present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TURLEY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

Mr. QUARLES. Suppose we transfer our pairs.

Mr. TURLEY. Very well. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], which will enable the junior Senator from Wisconsin and me to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WELLINGTON (when his name was called). I have a

general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WETMORE. My colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] is unavoidably absent. On this question a pair has been arranged between him and the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. QUARLES. By the arrangement which has been made I can now vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted inadvertently on the roll call. I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. If agreeable, I will transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON] and vote "nay."

Mr. HANNA. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS]. If he were here, I would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (after Mr. ALLEN had voted in the affirmative). The junior Senator from Nebraska being paired with the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], who is absent, he withdraws his vote.

Mr. BURROWS (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY], but I voted, believing that that Senator is in accord with me upon this proposition. Yet I do not know but that I ought to withdraw my vote, because I am not positive. Therefore I will withdraw my vote.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER], who is absent. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], I understand, and with his permission we will transfer our pairs so that we can both vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I vote "yea."

Mr. MCBRIDE. The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR], and I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that we exchange pairs so that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] will stand paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR].

Mr. MORGAN. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. MCBRIDE. I vote "nay."

Mr. MORGAN. I vote "yea."

Mr. WETMORE (after having voted in the negative). I should like to inquire whether the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Georgia has not voted.

Mr. WETMORE. Then I will withdraw my vote.

Mr. HANNA. I will transfer my pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Montana (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], who is not here, and I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 25; as follows:

YEAS—9.

Bate, Berry, Clay,	Jones, Ark. Martin,	Morgan, Pettus,	Stewart, Turley.
--------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	---------------------

NAYS—25.

Bard, Chandler, Clark, Wyo. Cullom, Deboe, Fairbanks, Foraker,	Foster, Frye, Hale, Hanna, Hansbrough, Hawley, Kean,	Kyle, Lodge, McBride, McComas, Nelson, Perkins, Proctor,	Quarles, Ross, Shoup, Wellington.
--	--	--	--

NOT VOTING—53.

Aldrich, Allen, Allison, Bacon, Baker, Beveridge, Burrows, Butler, Caffery, Carter, Chilton, Clark, Mont. Cockrell, Culbertson,	Daniel, Davis, Depew, Elkins, Gallinger, Gear, Harris, Heitfeld, Hoar, Jones, Nev. Kenney, Lindsay, McCumber, McEnery,	McLaurin, McMillan, Mallory, Mason, Money, Penrose, Pettigrew, Platt, Conn. Platt, N. Y. Pritchard, Rawlins, Scott, Sewell, Simon,	Spooner, Sullivan, Taliaferro, Teller, Thurston, Tillman, Turner, Vest, Warren, Wetmore, Wolcott.
--	---	---	---

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No quorum being present and voting, the Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 28, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 27, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOY indefinitely, on account of important business.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill making appropriations for the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that general debate may run until 4 o'clock this afternoon, the time to be equally divided between this side and the other side of the Chamber, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] and the other half by myself.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory to our side.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion, the gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate on the military appropriation bill be concluded at 4 o'clock to-day, after which it will be considered under the five-minute rule, the time for general debate to be divided between the two sides, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I understood there should be coupled with that a further request that the gentlemen who speak on the bill should have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HULL. It was understood that if general debate was agreed to be closed at 4 o'clock, then there would be a request that all parties who spoke on the bill should be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD. I will ask unanimous consent before going into committee that all members speaking on the bill may have ten days to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion, the gentleman from Iowa asks that unanimous consent be given to all gentlemen who speak on the bill to extend their remarks in the RECORD for ten days. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LENTZ. That privilege is for ten days?

The SPEAKER. For ten days. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair, for consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of an appropriation bill the title to which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriation for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no one on this side that wants to speak now.

Mr. SULZER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT].

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, we are face to face with an age of reckless and enormous appropriations, and especially large is the appropriation for the military arm of the country, and, Mr. Chairman, within the limited time allowed me I can not hope to go into any general discussion of this bill. It is a bill carrying a tremendous appropriation, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$125,000,000, but it does seem to me that while there appears to be no particular objection to this bill upon general principles, it is a useless waste of time for members on both sides to be standing up here indulging in crimination and recrimination against each other instead of pointing out different items in the bill which it might appear ought to be eliminated as unnecessary. If they desire to economize and have an idea of economy, they might go to work and lop off some of the extravagance here and some of the extravagance there as it appears all along through the bill as reported to the House.

Now, while I do not propose to make any objections to any of these appropriations in a specific manner, for I have not the time,